

H. J. The Extraordinary 5

C A S E

O F T H E

Bp. of St. David's,

Further Clear'd and made Plain, from the several

V I E W S

That have been made of it:

Wherein the Articles against him are Consider'd;
And his Lordship Vindicated from them.

They have Fought against me without a Cause.
Psal. 109. 2.

Nemo sine Crimine vivit, optimus ille qui minimis urgetur.

Printed in the year 1703.

Advertisement.

THE Book here undertook to be Epitomiz'd, though it has been Judged, by all Impartial Persons into whose hands it has fall'n, to be a Just and sufficient Vindication of the Bishop of St. David's; yet because of its very large Bulk and Size, it has been thought not so entirely to Answer the end of its Publication; for 'tis presum'd there are but few who have the Leisure to peruse so large a Volume, or are willing to be at the Expence of Purchasing it: It has therefore been Judg'd necessary to Publish an Epitome, or Abstract of it, (in the Method of the Authors of the Works of the Learned) which is here done exactly according to the sense, and, for the most part, in the Words of the Author of The Large Review, to whom the Reader is referr'd for a fuller account of those things that are but Briefly mention'd here, though not so Briefly, but that they will justify the Title, and Evidence this little Tract, to be a Full, tho' short Defence of the Bishop of St. David's.



THE .

Large Review

OF THE

Summary View, &c.

EPITOMIZ'D.

THE First thing that I shall take notice of out of this Author is, the Character he gives of the Promoter, and some of the most considerable Witnesses against the Bishop, which he thinks necessary to be consider'd, because on their Authority, he says, the great Metropolitan founded his Sentence.

p. 19, 20.

1. *The Character of Rob. Lucy the Promoter*, he was Son to a Bishop of that Diocese, who has not left a very Extraordinary good Name behind him: For he suffered the Palace of St. David's the Collegiate Church of Breknock and the Palace at Abergwilly in Carmarthenshire to dilapidate; He conniv'd at the Residentiary Canons, neglect of Residence whereto the Statutes of the Church of St. David's obliged them; He seldom administred Confirmation, tho' he was Bishop of that See, about 18 years, &c.

All which is observ'd only because the Author of the *Summary View*, pretends to advance *Lucy's* Character on the score of his Descent, but since, 'tis plain, he can derive no Advantage on that account, this Author proceeds to consider his own proper and Personal Merit; and here,

1. He observes that this *Lucy* was Secretary to his Father, and during that time (as 'tis in Proof) took Bribes of several persons, advanc'd to Spiritual Preferments, particularly of Mr. *Thomas Powel* of *Glasbury* 20 l. and the like Sum of Mr. *William Williams* Vicar of *Llanavonvaur*, besides Exorbitant and Illegal Fees, for Institutions, Collations &c.

2. In the Administration of his Registers office, he has exacted excessive and unjust Fees; in Punishment of which, the Bishop actually suspended his Deputy, and threatned to proceed Judicially against him; and at last question'd his Patent to the Register-Office, his Title to which is liable to many Just exceptions, from whence proceeded his wrath and Malice against the Bishop, and in Revenge, came on the Prosecution.

3. This Promoter *Lucy* has stood publickly fam'd for living many years in Adultery with another man's Wife; a very fit Promoter against a Bishop.

4. In the Management of the Prosecution against the Bishop, he has endeavour'd to Suborn several Persons, to Swear what he thought fit to put into their mouths, and threatned such as had the Integrity to refuse him.

5. He has received Money's and Promises of further rewards for undertaking the Office of Promoter, and also divers sums of Money for defraying the Expences of the Prosecution; all which particulars are not surmises and conjectures only, but actually prov'd against the said *Robert Lucy*.

By which may appear to all impartial Persons, not only the Infamy of this Promoter, but also the Wickedness of those who employ'd him, and upon his Perjur'd Witnesses, (as will appear more hereafter) condemn'd the Bishop of *St. David's*. Other particulars relating to this vile man will occur in the sequel of this Narrative, but this is his Picture in litle, fit to be set in the beginning of this discourse. Being a Compendium only of the Character given of him by the Author of the *Large Review*; from whom the Reader, who has a mind to it, may have a fuller account of him, this being extracted only out of the first 25 pages of that Book.

In which follows the Character of *Edmund Merick*, one of the Promoters principal Witnesses.

1. He possesseth in the Diocess of *St. David's*, the Rectory of *Pentair*, and the Vicarage of *Llanegwad*, the Præcentorship of *Brecknock*, and the Treasurership of *St. David's*, and yet lives at *Carmarthen*, and Scandalously omits to reside upon any of these Preferments, but being admonish'd by the Bishop to Residence, in Revenge, he has Sworn against the Bishop and Perjur'd himself.

2. It has been tender'd in Proof against him, that in an answer upon Oath to a bill exhibited against him 1695, by three poor Carpenters (whom he would not pay for work done by them, according to Articles) he did then, and there, For-swear himself before Judge *Powel* Deceas'd; the history of which perjury the *Large Review* relates at large.

3. Whereas

Whereas *Merrick* took upon him to Swear, that the Bishop had Simmonically prefer'd his Nephew Mr. *Medley*, to the Arch-deaconry of St. *David's*, &c. The same *Merrick* has in a paper which he himself deliver'd to the Bishop, written with his own hand, contradicted and renounc'd whatever he has since sworn in that matter, declaring it as in the Presence of God, &c. Other particulars relating to this man's Character, may be found dispers'd up and down the Book; but this lies altogether.

P. 31

Another Principal Evidence was one *Jeremiah Griffin*, the Abstract of whose Character follows,

1. He is Rector of *Differth* 2. Vicar and Prebendary of *Llanfawr* in the County of *Radnor*, without Residing on any of his Cures, notwithstanding he was oblig'd by solemn Oath; He had several Monitions given him by his Diocesan the Bishop of St. *David's*, to oblige him to Residence, which instead of Obeying, he with *Merrick* and others, who were under Monitions on the same account, Conspir'd against the Bishop, and enter'd into a Combination to asperse and defame him.

P. 33

2. He is of a most notorious evil Life, of a grossly Scandalous and infamous Conversation; for it has been offer'd in proof against him, that he has not only been often seen shamefully Drunk, but that he is generally suspected, and publicly fam'd, to be Guilty of the Abominable Sin of Adultery, which alone, before equitable Judges, would make him be accounted too Infamous to be believ'd in any thing he Says or Swears.

P. 34

3. The Large Review relates a very Remarkable History of the Transactions of this *Jeremiah Griffith*, in a particular Case; where appears so much Falshood and Forgery, Treachery, Knavery, and to use the words of that Author.) so many Premeditated and Complicated Villanies as would amaze any man to think any profess'd Christian should be Guilty of them, and more that the Testimony of such a Vile Wretch should be admitted against a Bishop. It will not consist with the design'd Brevity of this, to insert the History at large here; I shall therefore refer the Reader to p. 37. and 41. of the Large Review, the Author of which, reckons these Characters of the Promoter, and two of the Principal Witnesses (accounted by the Arch-Bishop himself to be the most Reputable of all those who Swore against the Bishop) to be a just Prejudice against the whole Procedure against the Bishop of St. *David's*.

P. 42

Accipe nunc Damnum insidias, & Crimine ab illo

Disce Omnes

The

The next thing our Author considers is this, viz. that the whole design of falling on the Bishop of St. David's, was the result of a Conspiracy of a certain Party, and Faction of men, who upon Political motives and Inducements of Pique and Revenge, united and combin'd to disgrace and Ruin him, of which he produces the following Evidence as clear and undeniable; and here he argues from,

1. The *Si Quis*, or Hue and Cry, which his confederate Enemies sent through the whole Nation, to make inquisition into all the Stages of his Life, that the behaviour of the Tutor might prepare belief (as the *Summary View* intimates) for the Aspersions cast on the Prelate; which method he declares to be extremely unreasonable and repugnant to the Laws of God, and all Nations, and if it should Universally take place, no good man could be safe from the Lash of it; and the very repeating some of the Interrogatories, put to such as were examin'd for the Bishop, to be a sufficient Evidence both of the Confederacy, and the base way of managing it, viz. Whether the Bishop did not use to quarrel with his Servants? What Non-Jurors came to his House? Whether he drank King James's health, or the late Queen's, or the Prince of Wales? Whether he at any time spoke disaffectedly of King William? &c. To which he adds, that a Great man encourag'd a search to be made, into all the passages of his Private and Publick Life, and neither his discourses at his Table, nor Prayers at his Chapel, were left unexamin'd to find some pretence against him.

P. 45. This indeed is an Original, not fit to be Copy'd, nor brought into Precedent and example, He observes the ways and means that were taken first to Debauch his Family, into an Opinion of his being Criminal, and then Suborning them to Swear against him, and he gives two very remarkable Instances of this.

One of which is Mr. John Castin, whom *Meyrick* corrupted by Lyes and Forgery, and false Characters of the Bishop, and Promises of procuring Letters Testimonial for him, from the Chapter of St. David's, and very powerful Recommendations to one of the Arch-Deacons of the Diocese of York, &c. all which is in full proof, and Depos'd at large well worth the Readers Perusal.

P. 46, 47. The other of Mr. Thomas Williams, who by repeated Depositions upon Oath, has Vindicated the Bishop from those offences, with which upon the importunity and Subornation of *Lucy* and *Griffith* before mention'd, he had falsely charg'd him; they promising to procure him great Friends, and Preferments for so doing. And though he made one Information against the Bishop, upon those inducements, and had actually paid the Fees for a Sequestration, of a Living, and License, to serve a Cure, yet *Lucy* the Promoter denied

deny'd these Instruments to him, and thrust him out of his Office when he came for them, telling him that he should have neither, till he drew up another Information, more expressly to charge the Bishop, which in *Lucy* the Promoters Office he actually did, in the words they Suborn'd and menac'd him to do it in.

This *William's* hath Depos'd from the Powerful Impressions of Contrition and Repentance, and the sense of his Guilt, begging pardon of God and the Bishop, for the Crime these wicked men had engag'd him to commit; The story is well worth Reading at large, and is to be found. p. 47, and 50.

He considers (in proof of the Conspiracy) what applications were made to several Persons (whose Credit is beyond exception) for Suborning them to Swear Crimes against the Bishop, which they had no knowledge of; Of which he gives several very notable examples.

First, Mr. *Solomon Henden*, Vicar of *Lawhadden*, has Depos'd, that he was importun'd, not only by *Lucy* the Promoter, but by *Meyrick*, and also the Commissioners at the Metropolitcal Visitation held in the Diocess of St. *David's*, 1694. to declare things against the Bishop, that would Criminally affect him. And the more effectually to gain him to Swear to the Fictions and Forgeries, they had suggested to him, they told him he should be Recommended to the Favour of the late Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, who (as the Bishop of St. *Asaph* assur'd him) would upon his and the Dean of the Arches Recommendation, undoubtedly prefer him. And besides *Jeremiah Griffith*, before mention'd, offer'd him in his Letter by Dr. *Oxenden's* Order, the Prebend of St. *Harmon*, as a Reward for doing it, and the Doctor told him, that if he would do something he propos'd, *Lucy* the Promoter should gratifie him for it. P. 54.

Secondly, Mr. *Thomas Philips* Rector of *Aberedon*, in the County of *Radnor*, was Solicited, and importun'd by the said *Griffith* and others to Joyn in the Information against the Bishop, and Thirdly, Mr. *Henry Rogers*, Vicar of *Llannavonvaur*, in the County of *Cardigan*, had many Promises made him to come in a Witness against the Bishop of such things, whereof he no ways knew him to be guilty, which particulars are fully prov'd. P. 55.

He says the Conspiracy may be farther prov'd; in that *Lucy*, *Griffith*, and others of the Conspirators, for the preventing the discovery of their Villainous Combination against their Diocesan (and for the better concealing their Wicked Practices, in Suborning of Witnesses by promises, and Threatening to Swear what they would have them) had hindered several Persons from appearing to give Testimony in matters of the greatest Importance in the Bishop's Case,

Case, to the Vindicating of his Lordship's Innocency and Honour, and the Cloathing his Enemies with Infamy and Confusion: To which he annexes an account of the Payment, or Promise of Money to *Lucy*, the Promoter, as well to reward him for, as to Encourage him in the pursuit of what he had undertaken against the Bishop: prov'd by the Deposition of Mr. *Charles Price*, &c.

Fifthly, and lastly, In Confirmation of the Conspiracy; He adds, That many of the Bishop's Allegations, as well in proof of his own Innocency, as for invalidating the Testimonies of the Promoters Witnesses, were not only refus'd by the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* (contrary to all Laws, and the Common Rules of Justice and Equity) but rejected by the Delegates too. And though the then Lord Chancellor declar'd in the House of Peers, that when the Bishop's cause should come to be heard by the Delegates, he should have Liberty, *Probandi non probare, & allegandi non allegare*. Such was the prejudice (not to say the Injustice of Bishops, *Barwick, Moor, Williams, Dr. Wynn* and *King*.) that they would not admit his Allegations, which could and would have been prov'd upon Oath, by very Credible and Unquestionable Witnesses, and Abundantly Vindicated him from those things whereof he was Accus'd: By all which the Conspiracy is sufficiently Evidenc'd, and the means also by which the Conspirators came to Muster up such a Troop of Witnesses against his Lordship.

To which he adds, that the Conspirators had been Guilty of the Villany of getting the Bishop Accus'd of Crimes, which were acknowledg'd afterwards in effect, to have been merely Invented and Forged, and of Suborning Witnesses to Swear to the Truth of them whose Depositions they were forc'd to give up, as the Perjuries of Infamous Rascals, Of which there are two very notable Instances.

The First, of one *William Perkins*, who was Suborn'd to Swear such an Act of Fraud, Treachery, Injustice, and Oppression, against the said *Perkins* which if true had justly render'd the Bishop Odious, which *Edmund Meyrick*, and others Endeavour'd to fasten upon the Bishop, and which the Conspirators design'd as one of the most Material Articles on which they combin'd, to get him depriv'd; but the Bishop being so Fortunate as to detect and defeat the whole affair by unquestionable Authorities, the Promoter and his Agents thought fit to drop that Article; The Story at large which is worth considering is to be found.

The Second is more Horrid; they would have represented the Bishop as guilty of Murder, and so brought his life into danger; which proving also to be their own meer Forgeries, they were forc'd

fore'd to drop that Accusation also; upon which our Author makes this Remark, that nothing save the confidence which the Conspirators had of the prepossession, partiality and favour of those before whom the Process was to lye, could have given them the boldness to Calumniate the Bishop with such Horrid crimes, which at the same time, that they accus'd him of, they knew to be false, as having themselves invented them; From whence he concludes that all who are unbiass'd may make a true Judgment of the whole proceedings against the Bishop, which will not be very favourable to the Metropolitan and his partial and unjust Assessors, who appear to be but too deeply engag'd in the Conspiracy.

These things premis'd, this Author applies himself particularly to consider a Scurrilous and virulent Pamphlet call'd the *Summary View*, &c. The Author of which he says, has obtruded on the world a very unfaithful Relation, and has behav'd himself very unlike a Gentleman (tho' a Knight) a Schollar (tho' a Civilian) a Man of Probity and a Christian, tho' pretending to be both. In order to the more fully considering and confuting of this Author of the *Summary View*, and answering all his Calumnies against the Bishop, he Premises these two things. First, that no man ought to be judg'd Covetous, much less an Extortioner, and Oppressor for being Frugal; and the Bishop having been censur'd on that account by those who were strangers to his Liberalities, he says 'tis now necessary that some of his Charities and Beneficences (which otherwise would have remain'd secret) should be publish'd: And here he gives an account of about 2000 *l.* given in great Sums to his Relations, besides what he has laid out in the Education of several of them, and does Daily allow towards their Maintenance. In the next place about 1200 *l.* laid out in building; for the Church on his Personage and Bishoprick, and lastly about 1400 *l.* bestow'd on Churches and Colleges, and other very Charitable and Publick uses; besides, above 700 *l.* to indigent Schollars and necessitous Gentlemen; in the whole above 5000 *l.* Whence he concludes, that the Bishop is not such a Lover of Money, as the writer of the *Summary View* has endeavour'd to represent him, and that his Frugality and Restrictions of superfluous expences on himself, that he may be the more Liberal and Generous towards others, ought rather to be imitated than He traduced for them; and were it not he says, out of Respect to Religion and Episcopacy, he could easily, make severe Reprisals upon some of our present Bishops, for the Piracies committed by them, on the Reputation of the Bishop of St. David's.

From p.
64. to p.
68.

The Second thing he premises is, a Brief account of the good Opinion deliver'd of the Bishop upon Oath, by persons of far greater Credit, than any of those who Calumniated and Defam'd him; and this Attested and Sworn by near 30 Witnesses.

P. 72, 73.

And these Witnesses for the Bishop, were such who had known and been familiarly and intimately acquainted with him for many years. To which he adds, that the more we enquire into the Probity of those Witnesses that appear'd on the behalf of the Bishop, and compare them with the Scandalous and Infamous Crew, brought to Swear against him, the more we shall find our selves oblig'd to Entertain a more Honourable opinion of his Lordship, then his Adversaries will find it for the Credit of their proceedings that we should.

P. 74.

He proceeds then to consider particularly what the Author of the *Summary View*, has advanc'd against the Bishop, and here he finds him reporting the first Deposition he mentions fraudulently and imperfectly; 'tis of one *Peter Lewis*, a Man of a mean Character and Rank, who pretends that the Bishop said to him, that the Bishoprick of *St. Davids*, was a poor Bishoprick, and that he would not be Bishop to Ruin himself, &c. To which he replys, *First*, that if the Bishop did say so, there was nothing Criminal in the words.

Secondly, he gives several reasons why it is very improbable; why he should say any such thing to this little Fellow, and *lastly*, that no belief ought to have been given, to any thing that *Peter Lewis*, either said, or Swore, for as much, as it was fully prov'd against him, that he had Perjur'd himself in another particular, which he took upon him to Depose, which indeed by the way, has been the case of most, if not all the witnesses produc'd against the Bishop.

P. 76.

P. 78.

And now he sets himself to examine, that which the Author of the *Summary View*, calls his first head of Accusations against the Bishop, and distributes into Nine several distinct Articles; All which though very minute and pitifull things, and if effectually prov'd (as they were not) could serve only to lessen the Bishop, and make him somewhat reflected on by nice and exact Men, but could never render him liable to any Ecclesiastical censure, much less Deposition, yet he spends Eighty Pages, in setting every one of them in a clear Light, and shewing the Wickedness, Malice and manifest Perjury of the Persons concern'd in charging him with those particulars. Nor says he, did the Metropolitan and they who were his Assessors act like Wise or Just men, by suffering in a Criminal Process, Inquisition to be made after things, which had they been Legally made out could have justified no Legal Sentence. I can not but think it worth the while for any Reader, who has leisure to read the whole at large, which will be found Entertaining enough.

from p. 78
to 159.

though

though I think it not necessary to insist on these things here (tho possibly I may touch at them afterwards) but Proceed to those things charg'd on the Bishop, which if true, would have Justly expos'd him to Ecclesiastical censure, before a proper Judge; [Which undoubtedly the Arch-Bishop was not, as may Evidently appear to every one, who will read, and consider, the Postscript to the Proceedings against the Bishop of St. Asaph, not long since publish'd.] Now the Crimes laid to the Bishop of St. David's charge, of this nature, were these three, *Extorsion, Simony, and Crimes falsæ*. The *First*, the Author I am now Abridging begins to examine. It being charg'd on the Bishop by the Author of the *Summary View*, &c. That he has demanded and taken, from the Clergy of his Diocese, excessive and Illegal Fees for Ordinations, Collations, Institutions, &c. Now before our Author enters upon the particular accusations, of that kind, laid against his Lordship, he premises several things in General, enough to vindicate the Bishop's innocency, and convince all (who are not under the Power of Prejudice) that nothing but Malice and Revenge, in the Promoter and his Agents, (to say nothing of him, who assum'd the Jurisdiction Power) could from thence promote Articles, or pronounce any Sentence against him; and here he Premises.

P. 159.

First, that it is allow'd by the Canon, to take Fees even for Ordination, which has Limited the certain Fees, to be taken on that Head.

P. 160,
161.

Secondly, that no Law but Custom, determines the Quantum for any or all Ecclesiastical Instruments, which Custom obtains not universally but is different in different Dioceses.

P. 162,
163.

Thirdly, that the Fees in the Diocese of St. David's are less than in some other Dioceses, particularly in the Diocets of *Canterbury, Sarum, and Norwich*; in the latter of which, many Pounds are demanded for the same Instrument which in the Diocess of St. David's comes but to one Mark; and more particularly, Whereas the Fees for Institution in the Diocess of St. David's are 4 l. 1 s. and 6 l. 1 s. for Collation, there has been demanded and receiv'd at *Lambeth*, and *Doctors Commons*, above 7 l. for an Institution, and above 10 l. for a Collation.

P. 164.

Turpe est Doctori cum culpa redarguit ipsum.

Fourthly, that Mr. *Slingesby* the Bishop's Secretary, has Depos'd upon Oath before a Master of Chancery (he not being permitted to do it elsewhere, so unjustly was this Prosecution manag'd) that the account of the Fees before mention'd, were deliver'd to him by *Rob. Lucy* the Promoter himself, when he went to him, by the Bishop's

B 2

order,

order, to know the Customary Fees. And that he receiv'd the same Fees and no other accordingly; For it was the Bishop's exprels command to him, that he should not receive above those rates: And that the Bishop search'd both the Registries of *Canterbury*, and his own Diocels; for Tables of Fees, but finding none was forc'd to acquiesce in what had been Customarily paid, and which *Lucy* the Promoter told Mr. *Williams* of *Brecknock*, Gent. in the presence of *Thomas Powell* Deputy-Register, were the just Fees, and sho in the Diocels of *St. David's* the Fees for Collation were but 40 s. above Institution Fees; yet Mr. *Charles Price* has expressly Depos'd that in the Diocels of *Warcester*, *Winchester*, and *Oxen*, the Fees taken for Collations were double to Institution Fees, and that the said Mr. *Price* having (during the vacancy of the Bishoprick of *St. David's*) been Entituled to the Vicarage of *Baughrood* in that Diocels, paid almost twice as much to the Arch-Bishop's Officers for his Institution Fees, then was paid for Institution Fees at *Abergwilly*; nay *Thomas Powell* one of the Promoter's chief Witnesses (and who had been Secretary to the Bishop after Mr. *Slingsby*) hath Depos'd on Oath, that the said Bishop in a Letter to him *Decem. 22. 1688.* had order'd him to receive 3 l. 16 s. for every Institution, and 5 l. 16 s. for every Collation, which was less than according to Custom his Lordship might have demanded; and *Robert Douglas*, and *Wilfray Pyemont*, Gent. have both Sworn to the Bishop's taking these Customary Fees. And Mr. *Price* has farther Depos'd that the Deputy-Register, had not only told him, that there were 40 s. more due for a Collation than an Institution, but that the Bishop in his taking of Fees, kept constantly to the Rules that have been mention'd, and that he never exceeded the Rates before mention'd.

P. 167, 168.

Fifthly, He adds, that the Bishop upon complaints made to him of the Arbitrary Exactions of Fees by *Rob. Lucy* the pretended Register (who is now the Promoter) and other Officers of the Court of *Brecknock*, for probats of *Will's* and of Letters Adminstration, &c. took care to have the Table of Fees set up in the Registry and Consistory Court there, that none might demand, or (through Ignorance,) pay more than what the Law and Ancient Custom of that Place Authoris'd: So little was he a Friend or Favourer of Extortion, unjustly charg'd upon him. And besides he not only gave Monitions to several of the most guilty, and particularly to *Rob. Lucy*, (since promoter) but also actually suspended the said *Lucy's* Deputy; And here he adds a few Instances out of many which have been all actually prov'd of extravagant and illegally extorted Fees.

P. 169,
170, 171,

To which, he adds the History at large, of the two Instances

of Bribery before mention'd, in the Character of *Lucy the Pro-*
noter.

Sixthly, He premises that the Bishop of *St. David's* has forborn in diverse cases to take what was legally his due, and never sued any who were in arrear to him for procurations (as several are to the value of 50 l. Which together with the foregoing premises, may abundantly convince all who are not obstinately prejudg'd, that the Bishop is neither the Covetous Wretch, nor the Henious Extortioner he has been accus'd to be.

The Former is prov'd by Mr. *Henry Powel*, Vicar of *Llangadock*, who hath depos'd upon Oath that the Bishop having bestow'd several Ecclesiastical preferments and benefices *Gratis* upon him, neither did nor would receive so much as the Fees for some of the Collations; And by the confession of the Bishops most Malicious Enemies, *Edmund Meyrick*, the Bishop forgave to one *Hewel*, the Summ of 3. l. that was legally due to him, *Meyrick* having represented *Hewel's* circumstances, the Bishop with great Chearfullness, and no less Compassion return'd 3. l. of the Money *Meyrick* had given or Sent the Bishop for fees due to him, to be given back to *Hewel*; And *Solomon Henden*, Vicar of *Lawhaden* has Sworn that upon his being ordain'd Deacon by the Bishop of *St. David's*, he had his Orders given him *Gratis*, and the like is also depos'd by *John Gwyn*, *Lewis Goze*, &c. And then as to the Bishop's forbearing to Prosecute any that are in arrear to him for Fees, we need only Look into his Book of Procurations for proof of it; For as it thereby appears that there is a great Summ owing to him, so it is most certain that he never so much as cited, much less compell'd any one Person to pay what he ow'd him of that kind. P. 174-

Seventhly, and lastly, he premises that upon the First Commencement of the process the Bishop freely and frankly offer'd in Writing, that if more Fees of any kind had been receiv'd than ought to have been paid, he would readily restore it to those from whom it had been taken; which is a plain Argument (and might have satisfisd even his worst Enemies) that if any greater Fees had been claim'd than should, it was either through Ignorance, or misinformation the Register and his Brother, whom he consulted, having inform'd him, or they whom he Intrusted to receive them, might have taken more than they were order'd to ask, or ever account-ed to him for; I say, these appear to be the true Reasons and not that he Acted out of Covetousness, or any Oppressive design.

Having premis'd these things and expos'd the folly and knavery, From p. the little Wit, and great Malice, (as he expresses it, of the Writer 176, to p. of the *Summary View*, in what he had said by way of Preliminary, 186. to his Proofs of the Bishop's taking undue fees (Where the

the Reader may find several things worth his Perusal. He proceeds to consider the detail of the Bishop's Exaction of undue fees, which the *Summary* distributes into three several kinds; of which the First is call'd, *Excessive Fees*, taken at Ordinations. For the Proof of which the *Vein* produces, three Witnesses. (1) *Thomas Powel* the Bishop's Secretary deposeth, that at two Ordinations, in the Year 1688. He did receive from every one who was Ordain'd 10 s. for letters of Orders, and that he did account with the Bishop for the said Fees.

(2) *Robert Douglass*, (Swears that during the time he liv'd with the Bishop (which was a Year and half) the Bishop took 10 s. for all letters of Orders.

(3) *Wylfray Piemont*, who was a Servant of the Bishop's, for Six Years together Deposeth, that for that whole time he receiv'd for letters of Orders, Ten Shillings; To all which the Author, I am now abridging has this to say.

First, In General, that he remits the Reader to the Foregoing Sheets for what he had said there for discrediting the Testimony of *Thomas Powel*, where he will find it made sufficiently appear that he is one to whom no faith ought to have been given in any thing he Swore against the Bishop [The Reader may find the account of him, Where many things are said concerning his Malice, Perjury, and several other Enormous Crimes.]

Secondly, that the Writer of the *Vein* is very unjust in citing out of large Depositions of Witnesses, only what he conceives may serve to defame the Bishop, when at the same time he forbears to mention those things Sworn to, in the same Depositions, which do directly Vindicate him from those things which were alledged against him.

For as both *Douglass*, and *Piemont* gave upon Oath, that the Bishop was free from Simony and Extortion, so each of them Swore that he never suffer'd more to be demanded or taken as Fees for Letters of Orders, or Instruments of any kind, than what either *Rob. Lucy* the Promoter or Mr. *Thomas*, Son to the late Bishop *Thomas*, inform'd and declar'd to have been Customarily taken and by usage due; Thus in General; But more particularly he observes.

First, That the Bishop was guilty of no fault in taken 10 s. for Letters of Orders, which was all that was Sworn against him; For the Admitting any into Orders, and the giving Letters declarative of their being Admitted into Orders are two very different and distinct things, and though the Canon forbiddeth the

p. 154.
155, 156.

p. 189,
190.

taking

taking any sort of Fee by reason of the former, yet it alloweth a Fee of 10 s. to be taken for the latter, so that here is no manner of Crime prov'd against, or indeed charg'd upon the Bishop for he not only did nothing against any Law, (And where there is no Law, there is no Transgression) but his Action was also Justified by the Express Approbation of the Canon; but this is not all.

Secondly, He replies that what all the Witnesses the Author of the *Summary View* produceth, all by the name of Fees for Letters of Orders, he through an infidelity sufficient to disgrace any man that pretendeth to Learning and much more to blast the Reputation of one who undertakes to Write history, has alter'd into the stile of Fees for Ordinations, intending no doubt to have it believ'd that the Bishop took Fees, on account of the latter, which not any of the Witnesses say, which our Author remarks as an Evident effect of his Malice as he is the Bishops Enemy, and of his insincerity as he is a writer; of both which his *Summary View* furnishes many instances.

Thirdly, he observes that the Writer of the *View* does with the utmost fraud imaginable, so word the Bishop of St. David's allowing those Fees to be taken, as if he would lead his Readers into a belief that his Lordship was the only Prelate in England who suffer'd the said Fees to be demanded and receiv'd. Whereas all the Bishop of England, do no less allow the taking such Fees, then the Bishop of St. David's did, so that he has as much Calumnated all the Bishops of England as him, since they must be accounted as Criminal as he is said to have been, or he must be allow'd as innocent as they. For it has not only been in Proof, that the Bishops of St. David's Predecessors in that see, have suffered such Fees, to be taken for Letters of Orders, (and some of them in Scandalous and Illegal measures) but it is too notoriously known to admit of a denial, that Fees for Letters of Orders are warranted as well as suffered to be taken, by every Bishop of the Church of England, and even by his Grace of Canterbury himself. To which our Author adds that, whereas this Writer of the *View*, hop'd to aggravate the Bishop's guilt by telling us, that it is proper to observe that the Bishop continued to receive the same Fees, at an Ordination in June 1696, which was after the Promoters Articles were given in, that from thence he will draw a contrary inference, and conclude the Bishop Innocent. For as his Lordship's continuing to receive them so long after the Commencement of the Process, does Demonstratively assure us, that he thought it Lawful to receive them, so enough has been said to Justifie that niether He, nor they, with whom he advis'd about that matter, were therein mistaken. And the Metropolitans having made

P. 195,
196.

made that, not only a Crime in him, but such a Crime as to make it as I have heard, one of the Grounds of the Sentence which he assum'd an Authority of pronouncing against him, doth instead of making the said Bishop guilty, only declare that some People were very Ignorant, as well, as Malicious, Unrighteous and Revengeful, which is another Just reflection upon the whole Proceedings against the Bishop of St. David's

The Second kind of Excessive Fees, charg'd on the Bishop is for Collations, and the proof of it, offer'd by the Writer of the *View*, is this, that the Promoter exhibited Copies of two Tables of Fees, Subscrib'd by the Deputy Register, and two publick Notories, (which many years hung up in the Registry) in which the Fees for a Collation are said to be only 20 s. and in the other, to be no more than 18 s. 8 d. To which our Author has these two Answers to make.

First, that admitting these Copies of the two Tables of Fees, to be Authentick and Genuine, yet instead of proving any thing against the Bishop, they only serve to demonstrate the Promoter (to be an egregious Villain, and that upon a double account.

First, because when this *Lucy* was Secretary to his Father, he receiv'd far above the propotion mention'd in the Copies of those Tables, as has been prov'd above.

Secondly, because this very *Lucy* (the Promoter) assur'd the Bishop, that the Fees for Collations were 6 l. 1 s. and his Predecessors always receiv'd, and the Clergy Anciently and Customarily paid so much, so that if the Bishop took more then he ought to have done, it was through *Lucy's* having Treacherously misinform'd him, and Villainously misled him; which has been also prov'd in the foregoing Pages, Only he says, he cannot here avoid the making this Reflection (though possibly it may by some, be thought severe) that there needs no more to disgrace the whole Judicial proceedings against the Bishop of St. David's, than that so Scandalous, and Impudent a Miscreant, and so Treacherous and Notorious a Villain, as *Lucy* appears to be (by what has been said and prov'd of him) should have been selected to be the Promoter in that Cause.

Secondly, He Answers, that the Copies of the two Tables of Fees exhibited by the Promoter, and said to be due to the Bishop for Collations; are no such thing as is pretended, nor do they in the least relate to what the Bishop has a right to take for Collations, but only the Chancellour and Register, who formerly had Fees out of almost every Ecclesiastical Instrument, as well as the Bishop: And this the Promoter, and the Writer of the *View* could not but know, and is therefore a fresh instance of the

the

the Dishonesty of both: For the Ecclesiastical Constitutions of 1597, to which the 135th Canon refers, do limit the Bishop's Fees in every Diocess, only by Custom and Usage. And that long and constant Usage had warranted the receiving of 6*l.* 1*s.* for Collations in the Diocess of *St David's*, has been already sufficiently prov'd; from whence he concludes that there was no just Ground of proceeding against the Bishop on this account, viz. Collation-fees, and consequently his being Prosecuted and Sentenc'd, as he was the effect of Pique, Malice, and Wicked Partiality.

p. 220.

To which he adds, that if the Bishop had been guilty of this Crime laid to his charge; yet his Deprivation on that account was very Unrighteous, and Unjust, and a direct Trespass against the 135th. Canon also. For all that the Canon allows is, that the Offender be suspended from his Office for the space of Six Months; so that the Metropolitan must needs Act purely out of Spleen and Malice, (very unfit qualities in a Judge,) as well as Partiality, since he only suspended the Bishop of *St. Agaph* for Six Months, who had been fully prov'd Guilty of much greater Crimes, and depriv'd the Bishop of *St. David's*, who tho' never so much accus'd, had nothing Criminal prov'd against him. To which he yet adds, that the 135th. Canon says, that those Fees shall be held for Lawfull, which the Arch-Bishop for the time being, shall under his Hand approve; And that he takes his Grace's constant Practice, in his Arch-Bishoprick, to be not only an Example set to his Com-provincials, what they may Lawfully do, but to be as Authentick for their Imitation, as if approv'd under his hand, especially since every Arch-Bishop is as much restrain'd by the Canons, and Constitutions of the Church of *England*, as the meanest Bishop of the Province is; And that the Fees for Collations have been, and still are, as great (if not greater,) in the Diocess of *Canterbury*, as they were in the Bishoprick of *St. David's*, is not only Notoriously known, but it is in proof, and was particularly confirm'd by the Deposition of Mr. *Charles Price*; Nay, they were more increas'd since Bishop *Laud's* time, in the Diocess of *Canterbury*, then in the Bishoprick of *St. David's*, since that great Prelate sat in that See. From whence we may see the Justice, Equity, and Prudence too of the Great Judge of the Bishop of *St. David's*; And to do the Bishop of *St. David's* right, 'twas he that caus'd those very Tables of Fees to be search'd out, and Copies of them to be Hung up in the Registry and Consistorial Court at *Brecknock*, because of the Complaints made to him of the exactions of the Chancellour, Register, &c. For Probates, Administrations, &c. (and for which he had admonish'd *Lucy* the Promoter, and suspended his Deputy,) and surely none can Imagine the

p. 201.

p. 202.

the Bishop so prodigiously silly, as to cause the hanging up the said Copies in the Court, had he been Conscious of taking more than his due, for the time past, or ever intended so to do, for the time to come: But tho' it has been made appear already, that these Copies do not at all affect the Bishop, yet he adds *Ex abundantia*, as a farther proof of the same, that the word *Judici* annex'd to every *Quota*, and particular Sum, mention'd in those Tables of Fees, doth plainly declare them to refer to such Fees as are payable in the Consistorial Court, and not to the Bishop, and besides we may observe, that the Fees there for Letters of Deacons Orders, are only 3 s. 4 d. and Letters of Priests Orders 6 s. 8 d. Whereas in both these Cases, the Canon allows the Fees payable to the Bishop to be 10 s. from all which it appears, that the Bishop is entirely Innocent, and the Writer of the *View* has advanc'd nothing in this Head, but either gross Equivocation, or down-right Sophistry; Here also he annexes an account how the Promoter, and others come first to Conspire against the Bishop, which the Reader may find in the *Large Review*.

p. 203.
p. 206.

He proceeds to the Examination of what the Author of the *View*, hath further advanc'd in proof of the Bishop's not confining himself to the taking of 6 l. 1 s. as Fees for every Collation, which is, that *John Barnet* hath Sworn that he paid 9 l. 1 s. or 2 s. more or less for Collation Fees, &c. To which he answers.

First, that the Writer of the *View* with his wonted malice, as well as insincerity, has reported this Deposition of *Barnet's* in so Fraudulent and Equivocal a manner, as if he would have the Reader believe that the foremention'd Sum had been paid to the Bishop himself, whereas the words of the Deposition are, that he paid it to Mr. *Slingsby*, the Bishop's then Secretary; so that if *Barnet* had Sworn true, it would only fasten Extortion on Mr. *Slingsby*, and not on the Bishop, since *Slingsby* has positively Sworn, that he never accounted to the Bishop, for more receiv'd of *Barnet* for Collation-Fees then 6 l. 1 s. But then,

Secondly, Mr. *Slingsby* has directly contradicted *Barnet* in this matter, and hath Depos'd upon Oath before a Master in *Chancery*, that the whole which he receiv'd of the said *Barnet*, for all the Instruments, was only 8 l. 1 s. And upon his first hearing of himself Accus'd for the taking 9 l. he offer'd to have Sworn before the Arch-Bishop in *Lambeth-Hall*, that he had neither demanded nor receiv'd more than 8 l. 1 s. But his Grace did not think fit at that time, either to admit his Deposition, nor so much as allow him to be examin'd in relation to that affair; For tho' by the Rules of Justice he ought to have done it, yet these were to be neglected and de-

parted

parted from, in Subserviency to Pique and Revenge. And all the measures of Equity and Righteousness were rather to be slighted and broken through, than that a Witness against the Bishop of St. David's; should have been so affronted in his Grace's Palace, and presence, as to have it prov'd upon him, that he had perjur'd himself.

p. 207.

Thirdly, He says, that it was not for the Fees of a Collation alone that the said Sum was receiv'd, but it was for Subscription, Sequestration, Relaxation, and a License to Preach, as well as for Collation; and that *Barnet* paid no more for all these, than 8 l. 1 s. was so far from being an exaction of more from him than was Legally due, that he was favour'd in having so little demanded and taken; So that instead of the Bishop's being Criminally affected by any thing in *Barnet's* Deposition, we have a farther discovery of the Unequal and unaccountable proceeding of the Metropolitan against his Lordship, in allowing what the said *Barnet* Swore to be of any signifi- cancy, to the proving him Guilty of having exacted excessive Fees, and also the Malice of the Author of the *View*, in defaming the Bishop in Print, upon so false, as well as so impertinent an Allegation: And this may sufficiently serve, in Answer to *John Barnet's* Deposition.

p. 208.

The next Instance Alledg'd by the Author of the *View*, in proof of the Bishop's taken excessive Fees for Collations is, that he had done so of one *John Lloyd*; To which that Writer says, by way of Preface, that as it would be endless to run through all the particular Instances of the Bishop's Exactions of that kind, so it is needless, considering how many are Crouded into Mr. *Powell's* last invoked deposition; on which our Author makes these two Reflections. First, He observes with how much artificial cunning the Writer of the *View* seeks to cover a Suborn'd Deposition, under the stile of an invoked one; for as *Powel* courted *Lucy* to Bribe him, so *Lucy* hir'd *Powel* to become a Witness against the Bishop, (i. e.) in this Gentleman's Modern Phrase, they mutually invoked one another. Secondly, That no man ought to believe this Writer, when he intimates that he could have brought more Instances against the Bishop if he would, considering he has shew'd so much Rancour, and Malice against the Bishop thro' his whole Pamphlet which he has fill'd, not only with Trivial, and Insignificant, but apparently false, and forged Stories, and would have them pass for proofs of the Articles Exhibited against the Bishop of St. David's, by which Title he stiles his Book.

Having said this, He Addresses himself to the Examination of what the *View* says about this *John Lloyd*; The Substance of which

p. 210.

is this, that for the Fees of a Collation to a Living, and a Horse not worth above 40 s. *Lloyd* gave the Bishop a Bond of 13 l. or 14 l. To which our Author replies.

First, That all he Alledges about *Lloyd*, is meerly on the Hear-say of others, and not upon the Deposition of *Lloyd* himself, and the Person upon whose Deposition this Story is grounded, is the Famous *Edmond Meyrick*, of whom enough has been said before, for shewing that no Credit ought to be given to what either he says, or Swears; whose Malice against the Bishop, as well as his Veracity, will evidently appear here in this Article, by his Swearing so much at Random, that the Horse was worth no more than 40 s. when the Horse was really sold by *Lloyd* for Four Pound after a Journey on him, from *Cambridgeshire*, to *Car-marthen-shire*: And besides two Witnesses Swear to the worth of the Horse, one, that 5 l. was offer'd for him a short time before the Bishop's sold him to *Lloyd*, and the other, that if the Horse had been his, he would not have sold him for 4 l. 10 s.

p. 211.

Secondly, He replies, that the mentioning of the Bond by the Writer of the *View*, is altogether impertinent, unless it be for the discovering of *Meyrick's* Malice, and his own Folly, seeing had the Bond been for 20 l. yea for an 100 l. no guilt could from thence be Lodg'd on the Bishop, unless it had been Specified therein, or could be prov'd that it was only for Fees for a Collation, that the said Bond had been given; And besides it has been depos'd by two Witnesses, that 3 l. of the foremention'd Sum had been lent by the Bishop to *Lloyd*, and 4 l. more was for the Horse's Price.

p. 212.

Thirdly, He replies, that the remaining 6 l. 5 s. (the whole Sum being 13 l. 5 s. and not 14 l. 5 s. as *Meyrick* and the Author of the *View* would insinuate,) which *Lloyd* gave Bond for, was not only for Fees for a Collation, but also for a Sequestration, Relaxation, Dispensation, and a License to Preach; wherein as *Lloyd* instead of having been illegally exacted upon, was considerably favour'd by the Bishop, thro' his not demanding more, so it may not be amiss farther to observe, that the same Bond having been taken in the name of *Thomas Powel* (and not in the Bishop's own,) the said *Powel* never paid nor accounted to his Lordship for it; and this is the rather mention'd, because as it Furnishes us with a fresh Evidence, of the Fraud, and Vilany, of that brib'd, (or in the Modern Phrase invocated,) Witness of the Promoter; so it does likewise serve to vindicate the Bishop from being that Coverous Person his Enemies have endeavour'd to represent him to be.

p. 213.

Our Author makes yet a further Reply to this Article, but what has been already said on it, may suffice for this Epitome. He proceeds

ceeds to what the Writer of the *View* farther accuses the Bishop of, in his having rak'd together vast Sums of unjust gain, by the taking of Exorbitant, and Illegal Fees for Collations, which he says, may in some Measure be conceiv'd from what *Walter Watkins* answers to an Interrogatory, viz. That the Bishop usually remov'd several Persons to several Livings upon the Vancancy of the First; to which our Author has several things to say; One is, That the Writer of the *View* has very Defectively, and Treacherously given us an account of *Watkins's* Deposition. For whereas, by his Relation of it, the Reader might reckon that *Watkins* had Sworn, that the Bishop usually remov'd several Persons to several Livings upon the Vacancy of the First, in order to his Raking together vast Sums of unjust gain, (and without that, there would be nothing Criminal in it.)

Yet *Watkins* Swore no such thing, but on the contrary, as declar'd expressly on Oath, that he knew nothing of that, (*i. e.*) Whether the Bishop's making these removes, was because of the Fees for Collations, which would unavoidably come on that account.

The next thing our Author observes is, that the whole Allegation is wholly Romantick, as well as Impertinent, and instead of Criminally affecting the Bishop, does only discover the Ignorance, and Malice of the Writer of the *View*; for which he gives this undeniable reason, Namely, that it never was, nor could be in the Bishop's power to remove any person from one Living to another, except either on the Desire, or upon the Consent of that Person: And the Bishop is positive that he never remov'd any, unless at the instance of the Persons, who for conveniency or advantage desir'd it; And therefore he adds, that had not this Writer forfeited his Judgment, as well as Conscience, and renounc'd good Sense, as well as Probity, he would never have made use of this, as an Argument for defaming the Bishop.

The Writer of the *View* goes on to charge the Bishop on this Head, by giving one instance of it, viz. That upon his Collating Mr. *Phillips* to *Aberedow*, (which by the way, the Bishop did upon the Intercession of Sir *Rowland Gwyn*, who has since rewarded him, by doing him all the ill Offices he could,) he made the said *Phillips* resign two Benefices which he was then posses'd of; To which our Author says, that *Aberedow* being the very best Rectory in the Bishop's Collation, the Bishop did but his duty in this, and ought rather to be commended, than reproach'd for it; And that the said *Phillips* has depos'd on Oath, to his own voluntary resigning of the two Livings, one of which was (upon the Intercession

p. 215.

p. 217.

of

of the fore-mention'd gratefull Sir *Rom. Gwyn*,) confer'd upon *Jeremias Griffith* (who in requital thereof, and of many other Offices of Friendship, has declar'd himself to be his Lordship's most Malicious and Revengefull Enemy,) and the other, without any Intercession upon a Person who had no Benefice, but Judg'd every way qualified for the having one.

To all which he adds, that the said *Philips*, Rector of *Aberedow*, has in a deposition of his own, given a Fair and Just Character of the Bishop, and therefore could not Harbour any ill thoughts of the Bishop on this Score; But this still shews what an odd
p. 118. man, to say no worse, this Writer of the *View* is.

Who goes on to charge the Bishop for not regarding the small value of the Preferments he bestow'd, and lessening his Fees accordingly, which he proves by the Testimony of one *Edward Gwyn*, that for his Instruments and Collation to a Prebend of about 40*s.* *per Annum*, reserv'd Rent he paid 5*l.* 11*s.* And for Instruments, and Collation to a Prebend of about 7 Nobles *per Annum*, he paid 3*l.* and that the Bishop said, he therein us'd the said *Gwyn* kindly. Now tho' this appears at first sight, to every man commonly skill'd in these matters, to be a very senseless Accusation, and to have nothing Criminal in it, and so to need no answer, yet our Author says several things to it, which I shall briefly recapitulate.

First, that according to his usual method of curtailing Depositions, the Writer of the *View* has again Treacherously omitted a Principal part of this. For this *Gwyn* has Sworn to the Character of the Bishop; and particularly, that he believes the Bishop would not be Guilty of Simony on any account whatsoever, yea moreover he Swears, that the Bishop had Freely and Frankly bestow'd some Preferments on him the said *Gwyn*, without so much as proposing to have any Reward, or acknowledgment, either directly, or indirectly, and that he had reason to believe his Lordship had done so by others, on whom he
p. 219. he conferr'd Preferments.

Secondly, That the Writer of the *View* in this Allegation, betrays his Egregious Ignorance, as well as shews his wonted hatred and Malice, in that the measure in which Fees are to be paid, is not ordain'd to be in proportion to the value of the Benefices, to which Collations and Institutions are Granted, but in consideration of such and such Instruments, be the value of the Livings more or less, and were it otherwise, it would be too much in the Powers of Bishops to be as Arbitrary as they pleas'd in their demands and Exactions of
p. 220. that kind.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, That the Author of the *View* makes himself Ridiculous, by endeavouring to prove the Bishop guilty of exacting Illegal and excessive Fees, by instances which prove the Bishop that took lesser Fees than he was entituled to. For in the former instance, as instead of 6 *l.* 1 *s.* the customary Fees, the Bishop took but 5 *l.* 11 *s.* So in the latter, instead of 6 *l.* 1 *s.* the due Fees, the Bishop took but 3 *l.* So that the Bishop might both with great Modesty and Justice, tell *Gwyn* (as the Writer of the *View* repors it) that he had us'd him very kindly; our Author adds also Fourthly, and Fifthly, two other particulars of this Writer's dissingenuity and falsehood, to impose on, and mislead his Reader, the last of which is, that he has taken notice only of the reserv'd Rents of those Prebends, but has said nothing of the value of the Corps of the Prebent of *Bongbrood*, and of the value as well as Privilege of having a Curial Prebend in the Church of St. *David's*, both which render those Preferments very desirable, and of advantage to those who have them, how small and contemptible soever the Reserv'd Rents seem to be. To all which he adds, that however enriching this unfaithful relation of matters of Fact, may have prov'd to this Mercenary Writer, or how grateful it may have been to the Metropolitican, because of its agreeing so well with the manner of his Grace's Jurisdiction proceedings, yet it must needs greatly provoke, as well as offend those who expected a true Narrative of what had been in proof against, and for the Bishop of St. *David's*, but instead thereof, have Lies and Falsehoods obtruded upon them.

p. 224.

The *View* gives another Instance on this head, of not regarding small Livings, and, *viz.* That the Bishop Collated *Jeremiah Griffith* to a Vicarage, and obliged him to quit a Beneficial Prebend, and take another without a Corps, (for which he paid the usual Collation-Fees) otherwise the Bishop would not give him the Vicarage.

Now though the foregoing Answer may as well serve for this Instance as the former, yet our Author has several fresh things to say to this.

First, He begs the Reader to be mindfull, that the Person that Swears to all this, is *Jeremiah Griffith*, whose Character has been given before, and who appears to be one who ought not to be believ'd in any thing he either Says, or Swears, as being not only the Bishop's avow'd and malicious Enemy, but also on many other accounts, too Infamous to have credit given him against any Person, or in any Court whatsoever.

Secondly, Whereas this *Griffith* has Sworn, that the Bishop oblig'd him to take a Collation, &c. He hath therein Sworn falsely; for as it was not in the Bishop's power, either to make him resign one Prebend or force him to accept of a Collation to another, without his

his own Consent, so *Griffith* does too well understand what is for his advantage to have ever done it, had not he known how gainful it would prove to him; nor will any Man be surpriz'd, says our Author, at *Griffith's* having Perjur'd himself in that particular, if they do but observe with what impudence he hath Sworn to another most notorious Falsehood in the same Deposition, viz. That he was so far from looking upon *Lucy* the Promoter to be the Bishop's Enemy, that he doth believe he has been one of his best Friends, and that he had never heard him use any Scurrilous Language towards the Bishop, as he can Remember, whereas not only *Lucy's* enmity against the Bishop had been openly declar'd, and was publickly known, but his having also spoken all the ill things imaginable of his Lordship, by which he could hope to render him Infamous, hath been fully prov'd by the Testimony and Oath of many Witnesses of unquestionable Reputation.

Thirdly, He says the Bishop bestow'd the Vicarage on *Griffith* upon his earnest and importunate desire and Solicitation, and *Griffith* resign'd a Prebend remote from the Vicarage for one in that same Parish. And if *Griffith* would not be satisfied without the Vicarage, he ought to be contented with the Prebend belonging to the same place, where the said Vicarage lay; nor can any other Reason be assign'd (says our Author) for *Griffith's* complaining of the Bishop's making him resign one Benefice, when he bestow'd two upon him, unless it be that his Lordship would not allow him to Monopolize too many considerable Preferments, which as he was Covetous enough to desire and aim at, so he is sufficiently Luxurious to waste Riotously on himself alone, what many would be thankful to have divided among them as a competent Maintenance; and considering that he enjoy'd besides the Prebend of *Boughbrood*, the Rectory of *Differth*, and the Free-School of *Brechnook*, &c. It was rather a fault in the Bishop to bestow another Living on him, without his resigning more of his Preferments than that one Prebend, and yet the parting with it appears to be one great cause of his Malice against the Bishop.

Fourthly, He says, there's reason to believe that the Prebend of *Llanfanhread* is worth much more *per Annum*, than *Griffith* hath Sworn, since the great Tithes are not annex'd to the Vicarage, nor otherwise impropriated, it cannot be conceiv'd, but they must belong to, and be the Corps of the Prebend, which however it be, the Bishop had then (and still has) grounds to believe they are so; so that nothing appears by this Instance, but the impertinency and folly of the Author of the *View*, which we often meet with, and a new detection of the said *Griffith*. The Author of the *View* is pleas'd to say that he cannot finish this head, till he has acquainted the Reader with two more
strange

strange Extortions of his Lordship; the First of which in short is this: That one *David Lewis* deposeth that he paid Mr. *Powel* 40 s. for the Bishop's use for a Dispensation for Non-Residence.— To which our Author says,

First, That *David Lewis* ought not to be credited in what he hath here Depos'd, in that he Swore his having paid 13 s. 4 d. for procurations at the Triennial Visitation, when in truth he paid not one Penny to the Bishop, or for his use; For though he had 13 s. 4 d. Extorted from him, yet it is fit the Reader should know, that it was *Lucy* the Promoter who cheated him of that Money, under the pretence of making him pay for Exhibition-Fees: but *Lucy* by being engag'd in so meritorious a Service as to become Promoter in the Process against the Bishop, was not only to have his Crimes conniv'd at, but the Bishop must likewise bear the reproach and suffer the punishment of his Villanies.

Secondly. It appears by *Thomas Powel's* Deposition, that he accounted with the Bishop but for 13 s. 4 d. the true Fees for a Dispensation, and therefore if *Lewis* paid more, or (as he Swears) 40 s. for the same to *Powel*, 'twas *Powel* cheated him, and not the Bishop; But our Author says, tho' it may be indifferent to him whether the Perjury lies at *Lewis's* door, or the Extortion at *Powel's* (they being both Brethren in Iniquity, yet he declares he believes that in this case *Lewis* Swore falsely, because *Lewis* had also Instruments of Sequestration and Relaxation, and paid the 40 s. for them all, which was the due Fee, however be it between them, the Bishop is not concern'd since he receiv'd but 13 s. 4 d. for his dispensation,

P. 232.

The next strange Extortion the Writer of the *View* makes such a rother about, is a wonderful one indeed, in short this. The Bishop did not think fit to unite two Churches that were distinct, but made the Clerk pay for two Institutions as has been done before (of which he gives several Instances, three at least) and 13 s. 4 d. for an Instrument of Union: Now this, I confess is a very strange sort of a Crime: For our Author shews at large that the Bishop could not, and ought not to do any otherwise then he did, and took less Fees of the Clerk than he might have legally demanded; He shews also at large how the Law stands as to Unions, Consolidations, and Pluralities, and that the Bishop took but 13 s. 4 d. for that Instrument, for which in the Diocess of *Normich*, the Clerk pays 3, 4, or 5 l. I shall refer the Reader who would have a full and Satisfactory account of this matter to our Author who treats of it.

from p.
233, to
P. 245.

Upon the whole he presumes to say, that admitting all that was Depos'd against the Bishop of St. *David's* was true (which we have shew'd nothing was) yet that would not have Justified the Arch-Bishop's

Bishop's Sentence of Déprivation; And therefore the depriving of him on such trivial Accusations would make an unbiassed man suspect that though these offences were assign'd as the cause of it, yet the true reason was, his so often dissenting from, and opposing his Grace, and some others call'd Spiritual Lords in the House of Peers, and therefore 'twas resolv'd to have the Bishop of St. David's Depos'd from his Episcopal Dignity, and consequently Degraded from his Baronage, that so he might be render'd incapable of contradicting them in Parliamentary debates, and dissenting from them by his Vote.

Manet alia mente repositum Judicium.

And a little after he takes notice of a very remarkable saying of a Temporal Lord, that if it were not for the Bishop's (i. e. the Majority of them) they should be able to save the Church of England.

p. 276. The next thing the Author of the *View* Slanders the Bishop for is, his having oppress'd the Clergy in taking excessive Procurations, of which he pretends to give three Instances, which he introduces with the Deposition of one *William Jones*, a discarded Revengeful Servant of the Bishop's, who is prov'd to have Sworn contradictorily (in another case) to one and the same thing, and therefore our Author says, ought to be look'd on as a Perjur'd wretch, to whom no Faith should be given in any thing, that he Swears; and yet the Writer of the *View* hath both Fraudulently reported, and injuriously wrested and perverted this *Jones's* Deposition. The purport of which is this, that the Bishop deliver'd to him a Book of Procurations to Transcribe, in which there were several Alterations of Figures; Now the Writer of the *View* would fain persuade his Readers that the Alterations were greater, whereas *Jones* Swears no such thing, but on the contrary, that he could not tell whether the Alterations were greater, or lesser, tho' it may easily be Collected, that they were lesser, because the aforesaid Book, being a Copy of that which the Promoter gave to the Bishop, at his Primary Visitation, for his Instruction in the Procurations he was then to receive, and the Procurations at the Triennial Visitation were only to be half so much, it was necessary and very prudent Conduct in his Lordship to have an Alteration made in the Figures, for the preventing the taking more than was due.

p. 449. Having dispatch'd this introductory Deposition of *Jones's*, our Author examines the three pretended instances of excessive Procurations, of which the first is that *John Barnet* Swears that Mr. *Jones*, at the Visitation 1691, demanding of him 11 s. for his Vicarage of *Hay*, he told the Bishop that but 5 s. 6 d. were his due, but the Bishop told him he must pay whole Procurations, since it was his Primary Visitation of *Barnet* as Vicar of *Hay*. To which our Author says in General, that

that he has already in the foregoing papers disabled *Barnet* from being a Credible Witness in any thing whatsoever, because he Perjur'd himself in a former Deposition, But more particularly,

p. 251.

First, That upon a perusal of the 137th. Canon, our Author does not see, but that the Bishop at the Triennial Visitation had a right to demand full Procurations of every one admitted to a new Living, notwithstanding the same person had, at the former Visitation paid full Procurations for some other Living, at least the Words of the Canon are so doubtfully express'd, that any other Bishop as well as he of *St. David's* might have put such a Construction upon it, without being censur'd for it: And the Bishop acted so fairly as to Read that Canon upon which he grounded his demand, to the Clergy, and before he took the full Procurations he had the consent and approbation of the Wisest, as well as of the most of his Clergy.

No. 5. p.
252.

p. 253.

Secondly, That it ought to be reckon'd an undeniable Evidence that his Lordship was far from designing to Oppress his Clergy by taking excessive Procurations, in that it appears there is above 50 *l.* owing to him for those Dues, and yet he never sued, nor so much as cited any Person into the Court for the payment of them, so that he who could dispense with the loss of what was legally due to him, would certainly never be an Oppressor of any; it being as impossible that the merciful should be unjust, as it is to reconcile Contradictions; and though it has been charg'd on the Bishop, that he had in those ways Rak'd together vast Sums of unjust Gain, yet our Author says, that upon the best Enquiry, he has been able to make into his whole Behaviour and Conduct in these and the like affairs, he may truly affirm that the Bishop did not become so rich, as he is said to be, by any oppressive way of getting, but a wise and Frugal way of spending, as has been intimated before.

Thirdly, He says, that the 11 *s.* which was demanded of *Barnet* was never yet paid, what ever he paid, or Exhibition-Fees, which as the Canon makes to be due at all Visitations, so are more especially and undeniably due, when Letters of Institution and Induction are to be exhibited the first time, and sign'd by the Register which was *Barnet's* Case with respect to this Vicarage of *Hay*.

Fourthly, He adds that *Barnet* was so much indebted to the Bishop since the Primary Visitation for Procurations for his Living of *Clyrom*, as made the Sum at the Triennial (even upon supposition that he was not oblig'd to pay above half Procurations then) amount to the 11 *s.* which he doth say was not receiv'd of him. And that it was usual with the Bishop to give his Welch Clergy credit for these Fees, and suffer them to be in Arrear, appears in that there is still above 50 *l.* owing to him on that account. These Answers our Author gives to this first Instance of Excessive Procurations, two of which he says

p. 254.

P. 255. will serve as replies to the remaining Depositions on this Head.

The next of which is, That the famous *Jeremiah Griffith*, Deposeth that he paid at the Triennial Visitation double Procurations for a Vicarage and a Prebend. To which,

P. 228. *First*, Our Author desires the Reader to remember what has been before said to render this wicked man *Griffith*, a very incompetent Witness in this, or any other Case.

Secondly, Also to call to mind what has been newly said of the 137th. Canon, on which the Bishop grounded his demand; and he affirms.

Thirdly, That *Griffith* in reality never paid full Procurations, as Vicar nor Prebendary, since there had been one third of what he paid in arrears for the said Prebend, since the Primary Visitation, and as for the Vicarage, he Swore falsely in that part of the 15 s. he paid was for Fees of a Resignation, which he ow'd to the Bishop; so that instead of his Lordship's being prov'd guilty of Extortion by any thing in this Deposition, we have only further Evidence both of the Malice of the Witness and the Writer of the *View*; to which our Author adds, that whoever enquires narrowly into this, as well as other Branches of the Juridical procedure against the Bishop, will be still further convinc'd that some people thought it no part of their Duty to Examine whether the things whereof he was accus'd were true, but whether they would serve to Asperse and Blacken him; and therefore such who had vow'd Revenge against the Bishop, (as *Griffith* particularly had) were Encourag'd in saying all the ill of him they pleas'd, without being in danger of meeting with rebukes, for their Lies and Perjuries.

P. 256. The Third and last Instance on this Head is of one *Henry Rogers*, who Swears, that he paid by the Bishop's order to his Servant 9 s. whereas he ought to have paid but 4 s. 6 d.

Now here our Author first refers his Reader again to the Canon which allows it. But Secondly, he observes that which he says will detract from all the Depositions given against the Bishop of St. *David's*, and that is, that this very *Rogers* has Sworn to *Lucy* the Promoter's having Endeavour'd (at the Metropolitcal Visitation at *Cardigan* 1694) to Suborn him to be a Witness against the Bishop, by telling him that his Living was small, and that as he needed not esteem himself indebted to the Bishop, for so small a matter. And that the Archbishop would take notice of such as would inform against his Lordship; and also that *Lucy* had in effect menac'd him, to Depose against the Bishop, by threatening that they who would not then declare the truth, should have a Journey to *London*, as sure as God was in *Glocester*; the meaning of which general words of Carssing, and Menacing is so obvious, that no man of Sense can miss discovering that *Lucy's* design

design was the mustering up of Witnesses by fair means and by foul, and that they who would not be Suborn'd by Promises, were to be frighted with threats.

Thirdly, He observes that this Rogers himself Swears, that one Mr. [unclear] was order'd by Mr. *Prise* to tell him, that if any more had been receiv'd of him, for Procurations than what he ought to have paid; that it should be restor'd him, which shews how sincere the Bishop, was in the offer he made at the beginning of the Process, 'that though he had never demanded, nor taken higher Fees, of any kind then as he was inform'd by his Register, he Legally might, yet that in case he should by the said Information have been mislead to the Claiming of greater Fees than he ought to have done, he would be ready to make full Restitution to every Person of whatsoever had been receiv'd of them, above what they were oblig'd by Law and Custom, to have paid; which is a full Vindication of his Lordship, from having had any thought of oppressing his Clergy, by taking from them Excessive Procurations.

Fourthly, He answers that the 9 s. paid at the Triennial Visitation, was the Procuration Fees that he was in Arrear for, from the time of his Primary Visitation; when by Law and Usage, so much was to have been taken from him, neither did he in 1691 (nor has he ever since) paid the Procurations, which were due at the Triennial.

And thus our Author ends the Examination of these things charg'd on the Bishop, and says he has fully Vindicated him from all the foregoing aspersions cast upon him.

The next thing which falls under his Consideration is, the Sin of Simony— (*Panlo Majora canamus*—) Which the modest Author of the *Summary View* is pleas'd to affirm was not only charg'd, but prov'd against the Bishop, to have been committed by him in many Instances, which before our Author proceeds to Examine, he offers several things by way of Preliminaries, whereby we may come the better to understand the nature of this Crime, and know what Provisions have been made in all Ages, for the preventing of it, and how such who were found Guilty of it, have by the Laws of Christian Nations, as well as by the Canons of the Church, been order'd to be Punish'd, which the Reader may find, which is all I shall say to it here, having a mind to hasten to the great proofs which are to be Examin'd. In the beginning of which our Author says, the Writer of the *View* both confounds and Falsifies, for whereas he says the Simony was committed by the Bishop in many Instances, yet in the next words he is forc'd to acknowledge that all the Simonies whereof the Bishop is so much Accus'd, do either relate to his Nephew Mr. *Medley*, or the Living he held in *Commendam* in *Cambridgeshire* so that though two are too much

P. 259

from p.
260 to p.
269

much, yet these can't be properly said to be many: As to Mr. *Medley* the Writer of the *View* premises that though the Bishop bestow'd on him many considerable Preferments, yet he complain'd of want of Money, and was disturb'd and Melancholy, and heard to wish he had staid at his Curacy in *Yorkshire*, worth about 30 l. or 40 l. per Annum concerning all which our Author also Premises.

p. 271.

First, That it does fully appear by the Testimonies upon Oath of many Witnesses of unquestionable Reputation, that the Bishop did not only on all occasions declare his abhorrence of Simony, but that he did both rebuke some of his Relations, for making Proposals to him that had a tendency that way, and that he did also refuse an advantageous Match for one of his Nieces, because there was something overtur'd in order thereunto, which might be construed to have carried a Simoniack Air in it.

p. 276.

Secondly, That the said Mr. *Medley*, is a person of such remarkable and known Virtue, Probity and Piety, that he would have chosen rather to have Starved, then come into any Ecclesiastical Benefice, by ways and means that were Sinful and Criminal; and this Religious Character of him, is given not only by those whom the Bishop produced for witnesses, of which there are at least 13, but also by many of the Promoter's Witnesses, as *William Jones Gent.* *John Barnet, Walter Watkins, John Philips, William Harris*, and even *Jeremiah Griffith*, who Swears him to be a man of a strict Life and Conversation, very Creditable, an Honest Man, and upright in his dealings, and a Man of Conscience.

p. 279,
280

Having premis'd these things, which he takes to be very Subservient towards the Vindicating the Bishop, from whatever he has been aspersed with, by reason of the Preferments he bestow'd on Mr. *Medley*, bestows two Reflections on the Author of the *View*, first to represent him as an ill Man, and unfaithful Writer, and the second to expose him as one extremely Ignorant, and this he does. And then, he makes distinct reply to what the Writer of the *View* had before suggested to insinuate Simony in Mr. *Medley*, that notwithstanding his great Preferments, he was not Gay, but Melancholy, to which

First, Our Author says, this may be resolv'd into a Man's natural Constitution, and they must be very ill Philosophers as well as no good Christians) who from one Man's not being so pleasant and Jocular as his Neighbours, do take upon them to conclude, that the former is Loaded with an apprehension and Sense of Guilt, which hinders him from being Merry.

Secondly, As to Gayety, our Author says, he does not find that to be one of the Qualifications requir'd in those who are admitted into Holy Orders, but rather something not very reconcileable with it,

St. Paul tells both *Timothy* and *Titus*, that the Ministers of the Gospel should be Sober and Grave.

Thirdly, That Mr. *Medley* was not so Gay in his Humour as *Meyrick*, and others of the Promoter's Witnesses, may be ascrib'd to Mr. *Medley's* temperate way of Living, in comparison of theirs, and particularly to his not being a Frequenter of Taverns and Tipling-Houses, nor so liberal a Drinker of Wine and stronge Beer, as other Gentlemen allow themselves to be. P. 282.

Fourthly and Lastly, it has been Depos'd by several Witnesses concerning the true cause of his Melancholy, one of which affirms upon Oath that he's morally assur'd the Melancholy into which Mr. *Medley* fell for some time, proceeded from a Cause very Foreign to Simony. And Mrs. *Elizabeth Hyde* Depos'd positively on Oath, that his Melancholy was occasion'd by the death of a Gentlewoman, whom he had entirely Lov'd, and intended to have Married, and that it was through Grief and Sorrow for her Decease, that he became so, and not because of any Simoniack Transactions.

Which plainly accounts for his wishing he had staid in *Yorkshire*, for by continuing there, he had not been acquainted with this Gentlewoman, whose Death had occasion'd his trouble and Melancholy. And as for Mr. *Medley's* complaining of the want of Money, he answers briefly, but fully, that those complaints were made soon after his being Collated to his Benefices which no man who considers the unavoidable expences incident to long Journies and removes, besides the charges necessarily attending men's first coming to Preferments, as Fees, Tenths, first-Fruits, &c. can at all wonder at; besides Mr. *Medley* was much in debt before, as will be shew'd hereafter. P. 283.

Our Author having dispatch'd these Premises proceeds, to consider whatever has been alledg'd by the Writer of the *View* for rendering the Bishop Guilty of Simony; and the first thing offer'd is a Deposition of *Thomas Powel*; The Substance of which is this, P. 286.

'That the Bishop collated Mr. *Medley* to the Prebend of *Clyddy*, in the Month of *May* 1688. and that he continued Prebendary thereof three years, during which time, the said *Powel* receiv'd the Rent of it viz. 15 l. per Annum, and paid it to the Bishop by his Order, and also 15 l. part of the fine paid by *Edmond Meyrick* the Tenant for renewing his Lease. In answer to all which our Author.

First, Beseeches the Reader to be so Just to himself, as to call to mind the account and Character already given of *Powel* by the Author, which is very much confirm'd by his directly For-swearing and Per-juring himself in this very Deposition newly recited; for there he Swears positively that the Bishop Collated Mr. *Medley* to the Prebend of *Clyddy* in *May* 1688. and afterwards that he Collated him to the Arch- P. 154. &c.

Arch-Deconry of St. *David's* voided by death, after *Michaelmas* 1696, by reason whereof the said Prebend of *Clyddy* became actually void; by which it appears, that Mr. *Medley* continued Prebendary of *Clyddy*, for only two years and a half, and yet *Powel* Swears he receiv'd the Rents for three years. Behold an Evidence stuff'd with Contradiction and Perjury! And what a Character does this give us, both of the Writer of the *View*, and this *Powel*? This is a fresh proof how inadvertently, and how much at Random the one wrote, and the other Swore.

p. 299.

Secondly, Tho' *Powel* Swears that he paid the Money to the Bishop, by his order, yet it does not amount to a proof that it was Receiv'd for the Bishop's use, nay that it was not applied to Mr. *Medley's* use, appears not only by diverse Depositions upon Oath before the Metropolitan, but also before a Civil Judge at the Assizes at *Carmarthen*, to which he adds another reply.

p. 298.

Thirdly, That forasmuch as the Bishop might know *Meyrick*, to be such a Sharper (i. e.) such a dishonest Man, as that he would be ready to cheat him, with respect to the quantity as well as the quality, (Mr. *Medley* little knowing the World or understanding Coyn) his Lordship therefore in great Prudence order'd *Powel* to receive it.

To all which he adds another Instance of the fraudulent Swearing of *Powel*, and the insincere writing of the Author of the *View*. But enough of that.

The next Deposition is of *Meyrick* himself, to the same story of the Bishop's ordering the Fine as above, to be paid to *Powel*; now here.

First our Author reminds the Reader of the Character given of *Meyrick*, before which makes him too Infamous to have been admitted a Witness against any Person whatsoever, and more especially against the Bishop of St. *David's*.

p. 42.

Secondly, This very Deposition of his, is enough to give us fuller Assurance that no Credit ought to be given, to any thing that he Swears in that, Whereas he has Sworn, that he was Tenant and Lessee to the Corps belonging, to the Prebend of *Clyddy*, it has been made appear by the Testimony of his own accomplice and fellow Conspirator *Thomas Powel*, that he was not the Lessee or the Tenant, but that one Dr. *Jones*, was so, and *Meyrick* acted only in trust for the said Doctor.

Thirdly. There is nothing in either of these two Depositions, of *Powel* and *Meyrick* that amount to any thing, like a Proof of Simony, but only some Actions of his Lordships are related, from his Enemies Malice, which rais'd the Suspicion of it; but if Persons be Condemn'd for things which do, at the most, only afford ground of Jealousie to those that Hate them, or that they have offended, we may then bid Adieu to all Justice in this World, and take it for granted, that all the Security men can have, for their Reputations, Estates, and Lives,

will

will be meerly Precarious, and they who are most Innocent, must suffer upon the Opinion of those who bear Enmity to them.

Fourthly, Though *Meyrick* for *Jones* paid but 25 l. yet the renewing was worth a great deal more, but the Bishop said when he understood Mr. *Medley* had made an agreement contrary to his advice, that he would not endeavour to break his Foolish Bargains, which saying of the Bishop's, *Meyrick* very partially and Faithlessly left out of his Deposition, on this motive no doubt, namely, because, if he had inserted those words of the Bishop, in his Deposition, the whole which he Swore, would have had another view and aspect, than he intended it should, and would have given men to understand, that the Bishop own'd the whole Right and Title of that Prebend, and the full power of Transacting all things relating to it, to be in Mr. *Medley*, and whatsoever his Lordship took upon him to do in relation thereunto, was by way of Counselling and advising his Nephew, who had to do with a Sharper and who himself had then but little knowledge of, and less Experience in the affairs of the World.

To which he adds another reason, by which it appears that the Bishop did no more then was Lawful and indeed necessary for a wise Man, and Friend, and to prevent his Relation from being Bubbled, and Couzen'd.

And adds besides, Mr. *Medley* had Morgag'd his Prebend to one Mr. *Rowlands*, which is not only a farther proof of his having a full Title to his Prebend, but also a good reason why the Bishop advis'd him to get as high a Fine as he could, and call'd his agreeing to take 25 l. for what was worth about 50 l. a Foolish Bargain.

And again, *Meyrick* himself has upon Oath Justified the Bishop's ordering the Money to be paid to *Powel*, upon this reason then given, (considering the then State of the Coin) Because Mr. *Medley* could not count Money, which our Author takes to be no disparagement to an Ecclesiastick, and after adds these very words--And whether the Metropolitans admitting such Allegations as these, to come into Proof against the Bishop of St. *David's*, for convicting him of Simony, does most reflect upon his understanding, or his Conscience ; I will not take upon me to determine, though I cannot forbear saying, that it has given the World a strange Idea of his Grace, as to the one, if not both of them. And Lastly he comes to shew, the Transactions between the Bishop and his Nephew, which were both so Legal and Innocent, that all Impartial men must be forc'd both to Pronounce the Bishop guiltless, of this Crime, for which he was censur'd, and likewise acknowledge with how much Hatred and Malice, and with how little regard to the rules, of Righteousness and Justice, some People have behav'd themselves in the management of the Process against him

him. And here our Author solemnly promises, that in relating this matter, he will govern himself with that single respect to Truth, which ought to be expected from every Writer, who would not offend God, Dishonor himself, nor impose upon the World. And here,

First, (In order to the rendering this matter undeniable, and demonstratively Evident) he observes, that it is Sworn by several Witnesses, that the Bishop's receiving the Rents of some of Mr. Medley's Preferments was not by reason of any Simoniacal contract between them, but in consideration of several sums of Money which had been really lent to him and laid out by the Bishop for him, and having long before executed a Bond for part of the same, after he was possess'd of his Benefices, he granted to the Bishop full power and Authority to receive the Rents of some of them for his Re-imbursement; and all this was done with that way of dealing that is not proper for criminal matters which are usually transacted in the dark.

P. 300.

See the
Appendix.

Second. He offers to view two Schedules, marked *A* and *B*, which were exhibited to the Metropolitan, and sworn to by persons of unquestionable reputation, which are accounts of what the Bishop laid out for him. All the particulars of which were stated and settled between the Bishop and Mr. Medley before sufficient and legal Witnesses of whom he there mentions no less than Six, in the years 1691, and 1695. before the Prosecution began.

Third He desires that it may be carefully observ'd that there is no one thing in the said exhibits or Schedules, which was not either admitted by the very Metropolitan, or which hath not been confest, or fully and undeniably prov'd by Authentick witnesses; and names some few of them.

First, Mr. Medley's Mother, Swears to what was paid to her, and Mr. Lambert as her Son's entreaty, and to the 300 *l*. part of his two Sisters portions, which the Bishop advanc'd at her Son's request (he having undertook to pay the said sums, but could not raise them at that time) she Swears also to her Son's being Indebted to the Bishop, for the Money paid to Mr. Rowlands, and besides she Deposeth that her Son, told her how very Just his Lordship had been to him, as to the Rents and Profits his Lordship had receiv'd out of his Preferments for his Re-imbursement, and that he was still in Debt to his Lordship. And,

Secondly, Mrs. Elizabeth Hide, a near Relation of Mr. Medley, and therefore most likely to be best acquainted with his affairs, and a Gentlewoman of great Virtue and Probity, deposeth to the 300 *l*. part of the Marriage-Portion of his two Sisters, and the 40 *l*. the Bishop expended on his Education in Cambridge, and the 6 *l*. paid by the Bishop for his Board, when he serv'd the Cure at West-Watton, and the

the 7 l. 15 s. for the Gown and Cassock; and that she has heard Mr. *Medley* confess and declare, that all the Sums in the Schedule *A.* were so paid on his account, and this she believes to be true, because Mr. *Medley* had no Friend, that could or would assist him in such concerns, and Exigencies, save his Lordship. To this purpose also are the Depositions of Mr. *Charles Pryse*, Præcenter of St. *David's*, and Mr. *Charles Price*, Vicar of *Llanarth*, and Mr. *Henry Powel* Vicar of *Langaddock*, Mr. *William Williams*, and *Wilfray Piemont*, &c. to which I refer the Reader,

P 305.

Fourthly, Our Author observes that Mr. *Medley*, has own'd all the particulars in the two Schedules, to be exactly true, and he reckons it an injustice done, both to the Bishop and Mr. *Medley*, in refusing to hear Mr. *Medley* when he offer'd to be Examin'd upon Oath. Besides many of these Debts were contracted several years before Dr. *Watson*, was promoted to the Bishoprick of St. *David's*; where then is the Simony?

Fifthly, In order to the paying of the foremention'd Debts, which have been fully prov'd to have been owing to the Bishop, Mr. *Medley* did publickly Authorise the Bishop to receive his Rents, since upon very Legal and Justifiable grounds he had a Right to them; and as no Secret was made of the Securitys which were Executed before sufficient and proper Witnesses, so *Wilfray Pyement* Swears his having been a Witness to Mr. *Medley's* Executing an Assignment, or Letter of Attorney to the Bishop, for the Rents of *Midrim* for two years; towards the Reimbursement of the 100 l. which his Lordship at Mr. *Medley's* desire, and in his name had paid to Mr. *Charles Pryse*, as Mr. *Medley's* Quota, or part of his Sisters Port'on; so Mr. *Price* Vicar of *Llanarth* has Sworn to his Lordship's being Empower'd by reason of the aforesaid Considerations, to receive the Rents, which accrued from Mr. *Medley's* Dignities and Preferments. And as there was nothing in all this, that bore any Affinity to Simony, or had the least Colour or Tincture of it, so none but such who acted upon Prejudice and Malice, could upon that account have thought, and much less have sentenc'd the Bishop of St. *David's*, for a Simonist. For it has been as unexceptionably as commonly practic'd for any Ecclesiastical person, who is legally possess'd of any Benefices, to convey a Right of Receiving the Rents to whom he pleaseth. And the granting such a power to pay a Just Debt, is the most Justifiable motive for doing it, and therefore nothing but Wrath and Revenge, or such like Passions, would have influenced men so account that Simony in the Bishop of St. *David's* and Mr. *Medley*, which all the world allows to be Legal and Just, and Innocent in others.

Sixthly, And lastly, he observes that after all that the Bishop receiv'd out of the Rents of Mr. *Medley*, Preferments, there was then a very considerable Debt remaining due to his Lordship. For the whole own'd by the Bishop, or so much as is pretended by the Promoter's Witnesses, amounts only to 531 *l. viz.* out of *Clyddy* Prebend three years Rent,

	<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
At 15 <i>l. per Annum</i> —	45	00	00
And in part of Fine, —	15	00	00
Out of the Arch-Deaconry—	156	00	00
Out of the Treasurehip—	315	00	00
In all	531	00	00

And it has been made appear by the Bishop's exhibits, and confess'd by Mr. *Medley*, and prov'd by the Oaths of many Witnesses of undoubted Credit, that Mr. *Medley* was Debter to his Lordship in no less Sum than 748 *l. 2 s. 10 d.* So that on the ballance of this account, there remains due to the Bishop 217 *l. 02 s. 10 d.* And when we consider that 7 *l. 10 s.* is to be deducted out of the 531 *l.* charg'd above, (for the Bishop receiv'd but 37 *l. 10 s.* for the Rent of the Prebend of *Clyddy* and not 45 *l.* having receiv'd the Rents but for two years and a half) then there remain'd due to the Bishop 224 *l. 2 s. 10 d.* so that the Bishop instead of being convicted of Simoniackal contracts with his Nephew, appears upon the whole matter, to be a great loser by, or Benefactor to him.

Our Author adds a great deal more for Forty pages together, concerning this pretended Simony between the Bishop, and Mr. *Medley*, and gives full and clear answers to every particular Insinuation of the Writer of the *View*, and farther detects as he goes along the Perjury and Contradictions of the Witnesses, the Prevarication and Fraud of the Author of the *View*, and the injustice and malice of the whole Arbitrary proceedings against the Bishop. But it would Swell this Epitome too much, to insist on every particular; and besides, I think there is no need of it; For what I have already Collected out of our Author on this Head of Simony with Mr. *Medley's* being a person of great Integrity Honesty, and Simplicity (his Adversaries themselves being Judges) is sufficient, I doubt not, to satisfy, all upright Judges that both the Bishop and Mr. *Medley* have been very much abus'd (to say the least) in this Unjust and false Charge; I therefore leave this matter, and refer the Reader who desires to know more of it to our Author.

P. 11 to
351.

Where

Where our Author proceeds to *Examine*, what is said by the Writer of the *View*, for fastening of Simony on his Lordship, in his granting one *Williams* or Mr. *Brook's* a Lease of the Rectory of *Burrough-Green* in *Cambridgeshire*, which the Bishop held in *Commendam*, and which the said Writer calls the other Act of Simony alledg'd against his Lordship, whereby he owns but two Acts of Simony, which yet he calls many; which is said with great thoughtlessness and inadvertency, to say the least it will bear.

And now that the Reader may the more clearly and distinctly understand this whole affair, and be the better prepar'd to discern the Injury and Injustice done to the Bishop of *St. David's*, in Condemning him for Simony upon this account, our Author says, he must beg the Liberty to premise a few things, which may serve both to mark out the Ground which this Writer and he is to Fight upon, and for measuring the weapons they are to make use of; Whereof the first is, that the Bishop had held that Rectory for some time in *Commendam*, and had at that time a Legal Right and Title, to all the Profits and Emoluments of it, which were considerable, and consequently his Lordship in the virtue of his Faculty, whereby he held it had a Free-hold and Heritage in it for Life. And,

Secondly, That though his Lordship might have continued to hold it still in *Commendam*, and to have supplied it by a Curate, as he had formerly done, yet through his being at such a distance that he could neither readily nor perfectly know how his Curates perform'd the duties of their Function, he thought it would be for the Edification of the Parishioners of that Rectory, and also for his own honour to settle a Person of good Fame in it, who should be oblig'd to reside constantly in it, during such a time, as was like to be as long, as his Lordship's natural Life, beyond which he had no Power to Dispose of it. And *William Brooks* being very much commended, to the Bishop as well for his Abilities, as Sober and Virtuous Conversation, who had not only Preach'd at *St. Ann's* with great applause, but who wore the Badge of a Lord's Chaplain, his Lordship believ'd he could not express a greater Care of his Parish than to settle the said *Brooks* among them.

P. 582

Thirdly, That all Parsons, Vicars &c. Residing, or not Residing on their Cures, are allow'd by Law, and generall use to Lease out the Tiths and Profits of them, and there's no doubt, but they who hold Benefices in *Commendam*, may as Lawfully Lease out the Profits of them, and under the Provisions and with the like Limitations as others, viz. of having the Cures supplied by Persons capable of being Constituted their Curates.

Fourthly,

21 Br.

Fourthly, That 'tis the same thing both in Justice and Equity, and in the Esteem of the Law, whether the Profits be Leas'd out at a Rack-Rent, or a Considerable fine be paid in hand, with the reserve of a small yearly Rent.

Fifthly, That 'tis as Lawfull both by our Laws, and Canons, for an Incumbent to Lease out the Profits of his Living to a Clergy-man, as to a Laick; nay there are some very Learned, as well as wise men, who are of opinion, that 'tis both more agreeable to Reason and Religion, and would be more for the Interest of the Church, to have those Tiths rather Leas'd to one of the Sacred Order, than to a Lay-Man.

P. 355.

Sixthly, That it was morally Impossible, there should be any thing Simoniackal in that Contract between the Bishop of *St. David's* and *William Brooks*, in that the Indenture relating thereunto was drawn by *Sir Francis Pcomberton*, who as he was an Excellent Lawyer, was also a person of that Probity, and such an observer of the Constitutions of the Church of *England*, that he would have never been accessary to a thing which was either Immoral or Illegal, and much less have prepar'd, as well as approv'd, a Lease, Demise, or Deed which was so directly repugnant to the Statutes of the Realm, and the Ordinances of the Church, as this is sentenc'd to have been; And this was under undeniable proof before his Grace of *Canterbury*, and those he call'd to be assessors to him; though neither with him nor them was there any thing that could be offer'd of the least significancy for the acquitting a Person they had a Pique against, and were resolv'd to condemn; and who was therefore to be made guilty, because he was then hated at *Kensington*, and thereby at *Lambeth*, *Ely*, *Salisbury*, and divers other places, where the Meridian of affairs was understood, and the Zenith of power so well known, as that the Clocks of those places were set to Chime and Strike accordingly.

P. 357.

Seventhly, And Lastly, He Premises that the difference between the Articles exhibited against the Bishop of *St. David's* at first, and the Articles prefer'd afterwards against the said Prelate, doth plainly shew, that neither the Promoter nor others who sought for an advantage against him in that matter, knew how to find any thing criminal in the said transaction, but that they were resolv'd to pitch upon some one particular or another, which they might among the ignorant, and before prepossess'd and prejudic'd Judges call by that Opprobrious name; For in the first Articles he is accus'd of Simony, and in the second only charged with fraud and deceit.

Vid. p. 358

And he takes the Arch-Bishop to be very partial and unjust in admitting these different Articles from the Promoter, especially since he refus'd some of the Bishop's allegations on exceptions, that these con-

trary

trary Articles of the Promoter were more liable to; Which, as well as many other parts of his proceedings are a sufficient Evidence, either that he did not understand the Rules of the Civil and Canon Law, and the just practice in Juridical proceedings, or that in compliance with his design of depriving the Bishop right or wrong, he was resolv'd to have no regard to them.

Having premis'd these seven particulars, our Author undertakes to examine the Testimonies produc'd by the Writer the of *View* on this Subject, of which the First is, Of one *John Williams* the Elder, who deposed that about *December 1692*, the Bishop and Mr. *William Brooks* came to an agreement in his presence that Mr *Brooks* should have a lease of the Rectory of *Burrough-Green*, and the profits determinable on the Bishop's Life, he paying the Bishop 200 Guineas for it, accordingly a Draught of a Lease was made, in which the Bishop alter'd several things, and would not allow the 200 Guinea's to be mention'd as the Consideration, and after he had received the greatest part of the 200 Guinea's he would have the Lease determinable on the Life of *Brooks* also, which *Brooks* was glad to accept of the Bishop giving him the Note exhibited by the Promoter, and Wrote wholly by himself; Now in answer to this, our Author says, that he has such things to say, which will not only fully vindicate the Bishop, but also leave disgrace and Infamy on both the Writer of *View*, and the Deponent, as well as some others.

And the First is, That upon consulting the draught of the Lease Exhibited by the Promoter, he finds the 200 Guineas are not therein mention'd, or made a part of it, and consequently that whatever alterations his Lordship might have made in the draught of the Lease when it was brought him, yet that it was impossible, his not admitting the 200 Guineas to continue inserted in it, as the consideration for granting the Lease, should have been, not only one of the alterations, but such a singular one, as should deserve the naming with a particularly; For though things actually inserted in draughts of Leases, Indenturs, or Deeds, may be either altered or wholly expung'd, yet it is impossible to have that blotted out of them which never was there. And therefore 'tis strange liberty that some men assume of asserting and reporting those things to have been in writings, which were never in them. Which tho' some men's consciences may allow them to do, yet common prudence and discretion, one would think, should restrain them from a thing wherein they are so plainly and undeniably detected to have forg'd a falsehood in matter of fact, and obtruded it upon the world as a reality and truth.

Secondly. Our Author adds particularly by way of reflection on the Author of the *View*, That what *John Williams* swears to upon Hear-say,

P. 359.

Ap. N. 3.

P. 361.

say, this insincere and faithless Writer makes him to have depos'd on his own personal Knowledge For *Williams* only says; That he had been inform'd &c. Which piece of Treachery and Falsification in the Writer of the *View*, bears much affinity and alliance, says our Author to the proceedings of a much greater man (whose Titles and Dignities only make him Great) against the Bishop of St. David's. For this Author has given us a Narrative of the Process against this Prelate, fill'd up with as much Chicanry and Fourbery, as he who took upon him to be sole Judge in this cause, and some of his assessors, discover'd Partiality, Pique, and Revenge accompanied with gross Ignorance, and a neglect of all the Rules Establish'd by the Doctors, for the guidance of men in Juridical Actings. He observes farther.

p. 362.

Thirdly, That whereas, both *Williams* Swears to his having seen the lease granted by the Bishop to *Brooks*, executed, and the Author of the *View*, after his wonted *Corinthian* manner, hath several times asserted that it was so, but alter'd from the first draught of it; yet during the whole process, there was never a Lease produc'd or exhibited, but meerly a draught of one; And whoever talks of Executing a bare draught of a Lease, shews himself to have little understanding, to say no worse in affairs of this kind. But our Author says, one may live and learn, in that whereas he had hitherto been taught, and was firmly perswaded, that no Court of Judicature whatsoever, could proceed to pass Sentence in Relation to matters which were only alledg'd, unless they were also prov'd by good and legal Witnesses, he has now seen under the Reign of the late K. W. such as he had plac'd in the highest dignities of the Church could venture to give Judgment against a Brother and a Comprovincial Bishop, upon a noise and suggestion of a certain Lease (suppos'd to have been Simonically granted) which during the whole Trial was so far from being prov'd, that it was never so much as produc'd.

p. 363.

Fourthly, He answers farther that as it was upon *Brooks's* applying to the Bishop, and not upon the Bishops seeking to *Brooks* that his Lordship came to grant *Brooks* a Lease of the tiths of *Burrough-Green*, so it was by this very *Williams* that *Brooks* made his Addreses to his Lordship for obtaining it; Which *Wilfray Pyemont* has not only depos'd, but even *Williams* himself has likewise acknowledg'd upon Oath.

p. 364.

And that the said Lease was to be determinable with *Brooks's* Life, we have undeniable proof given us by Mrs. *Brook's*, who though a party (being his Wife) and greatly interested, and who has likewise Sworn to divers things falsly, yet even she, in reference to this has acknowledg'd upon Oath, that upon discoursing with the Bishop, about her

Huf-

Husband's taking a Lease of the Tithes of *Burrough-Green*, she was not willing her Husband should so lay out her Money, which should be for her Maintenance after her Husbands death, saying he was but a Sickly Man. And that the Bishop told her by way of Answer, that her Husband was as likely to Live as she, of which Confession of hers upon Oath, our Author ventures to say, that it is enough to Satisfie all the Reasonable part of Mankind, that the Lease which was granted by the Bishop to *Brooks*, of the Tithes of the Rectory of *Burrough-Green*, was to determine with the Life of the said *Brooks*; for can any who have not lost the use of their Understanding, imagine that either Mrs. *Brooks* would have made the Sickness of her Husband an Exception to the laying out of her Money on such a Lease, or that the Bishop would have replied to her, that her Husband was as likely to Live as she was, unless it had been Concerted and Agreed the said Lease should be determinable on *William Brooks's* Life.

P. 365.

'Tis true, the Bishop was impos'd on, in being made to believe that *Brooks* was a Clergy-man, when he was not; nor is the Bishop of *St. David's* the only Prelate that has been deceiv'd in that kind, seeing (besides others) the present Bishop of *Ely*, Dr. *Patrick*, was once so deceiv'd in the same way, as to give Institution to the Vicarage of *Croyden*, to a meer Lay-man, upon which the Patroness for that time lost her Right of Presenting, and one who was a Clerk came to be instituted on the King's Presentation. And no wonder if the Bishop took him for a Priest, after what has been before said of his Praeching at *St. Anns*, and wearing the Badge of an Earl's Chaplain; and supposing the Bishop knew him to be a Lay-man, this instead of making him liable to Simony, will indisputably free him from it, in that a Lay-man could not have a Lease of the Cure made to him, and therefore the whole agreed for, between the Bishop and him, must be only Glebe-Land, Tithes, and Profits of that kind, and not the Curacy it self, nor any thing that goes under the Nomination of Spiritual.

P. 368.

Finally, whereas the Author of the *View* takes upon him, to report that *Williams* had Sworn to *Brooks's*, having been put to 30*l.* Expence, in going down to *Burrough-Green*, our Author replies.

First, That the Writer of the *View*, is here guilty of two Falsifications (1) in that he obtrudes upon his Readers, as if *Williams* Swore this upon his own knowledge, which he only did upon hearsay, and (2) that he puts down positively 30*l.* when *William* says only about 30*l.*

Secondly, He replies that 'tis not true, that he was at the Expence of about 30*l.* seeing besides his Coach-hire, some Bottles of Wine, and some Papers of Fruit, which he put into the Coach, his whole Expence

F

was

was but 3 l. 7 s. and he that can make Simony out of that Sum, may make Simony out of the most Virtuous, as well as legal Actions a man can do.

P. 369.

The next thing the Writer of the *Viem* insists on, is some Exceptionable Clauses in the Lease between the Bishop of St. David's, and this *William Brooks*. To which our Author replies,

Ag. 9.

P. 370.

First, That the matter of Fact is falsely reported to the Reader, for that which the Writer of the *Viem* calls a Lease, is only a draught of a Lease, which is a Writing, that a Scrivener for 10 s. could fill in whatever is suggested to him, and never is allow'd in *Westminster Hall*, to be so much as taken notice of, much less admitted as Evidence either against Plaintiff or Defendant.

P. 374.

Secondly, That though *Williams* and the Author of the *Viem*, have both positively affirm'd, that the Lease had been granted on the Consideration of 200 Guineas, yet there is not the least Mention of it in any of the Clauses, which this Writer has given us out of the Lease, by which observation our Author designs to shew what little Credit is to be given to this Writer in any thing he reports, and how his most plausible reasons for aspersing the Bishop of St. David's, are Superstructed upon meer Fictions and Forgeries: 'Tis true he takes upon him to affirm, that the draught of the Lease Exhibited by the Promoter, was not the same draught which the Bishop alter'd, which as it is a notorious Falseshood, serves only to convince us of his being desirous to preserve the Reputation of his understanding, at the Expence of his Conscience. Yet so Silly and void of Judgment, is this Writer, that he has given Testimony against himself; For by his having Expressly, and in Terminis declar'd, that *Williams* was told the Bishop alter'd the Lease he Executed from the Draught alone recited, he has plainly thereby Confess'd, that the draught Exhibited by the Promoter, was the very same which the Bishop alter'd, and it has been shewn before, that there was not the least mention of 200 Guineas therein. But to set this matter right, and beyond all possibility of being gain-said, our Author recites what *Williams* has Sworn in this matter, Namely, that he having seen the Indenture Exhibited by the Promoter, doth Depose upon Oath, that it is the very same draught, which was drawn pursuant to the first Agreement, between the Bishop and *Brooks*, and the same which the Bishop interlin'd— so that from hence, our Author ventures to say, that the Writer of the *Viem*, is one who knows neither how to write with Judgment nor Sincerity.

Thirdly, Our Author adds, that the not producing the Lease it self, which had been Executed, is a most convincing Evidence, that the Bishop's most Malicious Enemies could find nothing in it, that could

Cri-

Criminally affect his Lordship, and this shews how Illegally, as well as unjustly, the Bishop's pretended Judges behav'd themselves in this matter, when instead of calling for a sight of the Lease which had been Executed, and whereof alone they could Legally take Cognisance, they altogether confin'd themselves to the taking notice of Clauses said to be in an imperfect draught, which men either of Honor or Justice, would have accounted of no Significancy as to the Fastning a Crime on any Person; and this deserves the more to be taken Notice of, because if the Executed Lease was extant, it might have been come by, and produc'd more easily and pertinently, than an Interlin'd Draught, which had been thrown aside; And this *Lucy* the Promoter seems to besensible of, and therefore has taken Sanctuary in a notorious Lie, for that no less impudent than malicious man has in his additional Article made it a special matter against the Bishop, that instead of executing a Lease, he only gave a certain Writing in the nature of a Note, Sign'd and Seal'd: In which he is not only contradicted (and consequently declar'd a shameless Lyar) by the Author of the *View*, who reporteth that Mr. *Williams* has told us, the Bishop alter'd the Lease he Executed, from the Draught which hath been recited, but this very *Lucy* himself hath acknowledg'd, that the Bishop had given and executed a Lease to *Brooks*, so that we may conclude indubitably from what hath been declar'd, that there was a Lease actually executed; and since neither the Metropolitan call'd for a sight of it, nor the Promoter offer'd to produce it, but in the place of it, they insisted and proceeded on an Interlin'd Draught; every man who is impartial, may thereby be fully convinc'd that there was nothing in the executed Lease, for which the Bishop's greatest Enemies could hope to get him made any ways a Criminal, and much less a Simonist; but that rather than his Lordship should escape the Wrath and Revenge of his Prosecutors, and of him who assum'd the Sole Jurisdicitive power, they resolv'd to break thro' all methods, and to trample upon all the Rules of Law and Justice.

P. 376.

And now, though our Author has by the Answers already given, made the Clauses recited by the Writer of the *View* altogether useless as to the fastnig any Crime on the Bishop, and has also undeniably shown that they were both impertinently alledg'd, and unjustly admitted in Evidence against his Lordship, and thereby render'd it altogether needless to add any thing by reply, to this or that particular Clause; yet he begs the Readers pardon, if for the preventing complaints of his having neglected the taking notice of every thing produc'd and urg'd against the Bishop by the said Author, he makes some Reflections on those Clauses, in which he shews that there is not any thing in any of them that deserves to be so much as blam'd or

cenfur'd ; and much less (had not some People renounc'd Reason, as well as been at Enmity with Honesty and Justice) the least particular on which Simony can be ground'd ; and on this he spends several pages, to which I refer the Reader.

p. 377 to
381.

The next thing about which he Encounters the Writer of the *View* is, concerning a certain Note, which he says the Bishop wrote himself, and gave to *Brooks's*, promising, that he would Resign the Rectory of *Burrough-Green*, whenever *Brooks* should desire it : To which our Author says, First, that it is commonly Practic'd by Patrons (though he does not Justifie, much less greatly commend it) and that with general allowance, to take Bonds from Presentees for Resignation in some certain cases, and therefore it must needs sound odd in the ears of the sober part of Mankind, that the Bishop's gratuitous Note to *Brooks*, should be made a punishable Crime, and much more Simonical. And this is the more observable, in that the very present Bishop of *Salisbury*, who was the great Instigator to all the severities against the Bishop of *St. David's*, is known to have taken Bonds from persons for the resigning their dignities upon some certain conditions ; And were there an enquiry made into all the particular cases wherein he hath done so, it is to be fear'd that he would not in some of them be found to have acted with that innocency, as the Bishop of *St. David's* did, in that note he gave to *Brooks* ; but while Judicial power and Authority stand vested in some people, we are not to be surpris'd, That *Dat veniam Corvis vexat censura Columbas*.

p. 382.

Secondly, He says that the Bishop's giving the said Note to *Brooks* was not at all like that practice of Bonds of Resignation before mention'd, for it was granted on no Consideration, nor any thing demand'd or receiv'd as a motive to it, so that the whole that malice it self can say concerning it, is, that the Bishop was willing to gratifie the request and importunity of a weak unthinking man, in promising to do that for him, if desir'd ; Which he knew that *Brooks*, without being false to his own interest never would, nor could desire ; For there was no manner of probability, that if the Bishop had Resign'd the Patroness would ever present *Brooks* to it, for several reasons, first that all that even a mercenary Advocate can make of that Note is that it was the gratifying a vanity and humour in so weak a man as *Brooks*, and a certain piece of inadvertent compliance in the Bishop but was no offence either against Law or Canon, and much less had any thing in it of Simoniackal corruption.

Thirdly, He says farther, That if his Lordship could have resign'd without doing any injury to *Brooks*, he had done a very wise thing, for thereby he would have been releas'd from the burden of the Cure which that the Bishop esteem'd to be so, he has given a sufficient demon-

stration

stration by his Resignation of that very Rectory, soon after the Death of Mr. Brooks; when the right of receiving all the Profits (which amounted to above 100 *l. per Annum*) was re-invested in his Lordship, upon the expiration of Brooks's Lease, which terminated with his Life; and as the Bishop did resign it into the hands of the Diocesan, the Bishop of Ely, so none of his most malicious Enemies have been able to accuse him of any thing that was either Simoniacal, or Scandalous, in the Resignation of it, nor was it possible there should be any such thing, considering to whom he resign'd it; and hereby he has given (the world) an undeniable proof that he is not the Covetous man he has been represented to be, and that it is next to Morally impossible, that he who upon such Christian motives, and after so generous a manner, resign'd the Rectory of *Burrough-Green*, when he might have Legally held it, should be capable during his incumbency, of committing the Crime of Simony in the disposing and Leasing out the Tithes of it.

p. 385.

Fourthly, He adds, That as the Writer of the *View* has acknowledg'd that the Draught of the Lease (whereof enough has been said already) did imply only a Conventional Simony, but not a real, so he has likewise declar'd, that the very Note it self could not amount to the proof of a real Simony, by reason that the Bishop had not the Right of Patronage of the said Rectory; from which, says our Author, I may be allow'd justly to infer, and I will therefore demonstratively conclude, that the whole which the Writer of the *View* hath taken upon him so clamorously to say of the Bishop, because of the foremention'd Note, is by his own Confession meer Slander and Calumny; and that by his endeavouring from thence to get the Bishop believ'd to be chargable with Simony, he hath only discover'd himself to be a weak and impertinent man, and withall, an avow'd and egregious defamer, as also a mercenary, impertinent, faithless, and contradictory Writer.

p. 386.

p. 387.

The next thing consider'd, is a Deposition made by Mrs. Brooks, the late Wife of *William Brooks*, on which our Author makes many Reflections, which shew the weakness, fraudulency, and infidelity of the Writer of the *View*, and the inconsistencies and self-contradictions of a silly, interested, bigotted, fanatical Woman, who was only tamper'd with, and suborn'd to Swear what she did. For it is not unworthy of particular remark, that as Dr. *Faucunbridge* was the Bishop's scandalous Chancellor, so he was the Metropolitans signal Advocate, and the Bishop's great and declar'd Enemy, he not only came to Mrs. Brooks to desire her to be a Witness against the Bishop of *St. David's*, but even she confess'd to Mr. Price, that not only *Lucy* the Promoter, but others also, would give her a good reward, provided she would deliver to them the Bishop's Note above mention'd, whereby we may understand how maliciously and revengefully the Bishop was Prosecuted, in that not only an

Hue

226
 Hue and Cry was sent through the Nation against him, and the *Poffes Regni* call'd to defame, and run him down, but all that could be done either in the methods of Application, Addreffes, and Careffes, or in the way of Subornation and Bribery, was practis'd for the mustering up of Witnesses to blacken and asperse that Prelate. Our Author adds, p. 390. that most of what Mrs. *Brooks* depos'd, was on Hear-say, which would not have been regarded by men of Integrity and Justice; and from the whole Tenor of her Deposition, it does appear that the Money her Husband was to pay, was for a Lease of the Tithes, and not the Curacy—And that there was nothing in proof of the full payment of the 200 l.

And what Mrs. *Brooks* Swore against the Bishop, was after her making Application to his Lordship, for returning part of the Fine which her Husband paid, and the Bishop having deny'd to grant it, on the the foot of right and obligation, tho' he offer'd to have given her Testimonies of his bounty, provided she would address as a supplicant; and as nothing can more evidently demonstrate that there was nothing in the Transactions between the Bishop and *Brooks*, by which his Lordship could imagine it was possible Criminally to affect him, than that he deny'd to give her any Money on the foundation of a Claim, so it shews him to be more liberal and generous than his Enemies have represented him, that he offer'd to be kind to her, if she would have thrown herself upon his favour and Charity. For the proof of which, he produces a full Deposition. p. 392.

And as to the Clamour which had been rais'd of the loss which *Brooks* and his Wife sustain'd, by his Dying so soon after he had the Lease of the Tithes of *Burrough-Green*, our Author makes it appear, that *Brooks* had a very Profitable Advantagious Bargain, and that the Bishop alone was damag'd.

For, *First*, The Bishop at *Brook's* request, bought for him Household Goods to the value of above 50 l. for which his Lordship was never paid; then the Bishop gave him freely the whole Years Rent, which was due from the former Tenant before the Commencemen of *Brooks's* Lease, and besides, the Corn and Profits of the Rectory, when seiz'd upon Execution after *Brooks's* Death, discharg'd above 200 l. Debt, which *Brooks* had run into: Moreover it cost the Bishop 30 l. to Repair the Parsonage-House, and out-houses, &c. which *Brooks*, during his being in Possession of that Rectory, had suffer'd to decay, and dilapidate not to mention.

Secondly, His Lordship's being liable to pay above 10 l. to Mr. *Barrel*, for serving the Cure in *Brooks's* lifetime, and lastly it appears in proof, the Bishop receiv'd but 120 l. as a Fine for the Lease, and that at two payments; all which particulars, when the Reader lays them together, will

will make it easily perceivable what a Looser the Bishop was by this bargain, and none but he has just cause to complain.

Lastly, Our Author says, That the admitting Mrs. Brooks to be a Witness against the Bishop of St. David's, was against all Rules of Law; (for which he Quotes the Books of many Civilians, as he does also in many other places) and the Metropolitan, together with those of his Assessors, who in concurrence with him, laid weight upon her Testimony, did thereby in effect declare, that their business was not so much to Try his Lordship, as to Condemn him. P. 395.

I now come to the last thing the Author of the *View* charges the Bishop with, which is a greater Crime than Extortion or Simony it self (if a Bishop in his Ecclesiastical capacity can commit a greater) says this confident Writer, and that is *Crimen falsi*; by which me means the Bishop's certifying to Letters of Orders, that the Oaths on such occasions requir'd were given, when really they were not; To which our Author answers first by premising several particulars.

First, Concerning the Nature of *Crimen falsi*, and the different kinds and species of it, and Opinion of the Civilians about it.

Secondly, That in order to the convicting any body of it, there ought to be proof, that it was done fraudulently, and with ill design.

Thirdly, That 'tis also a Rule in Law, that the vindication of the innocency of a person, shall be allow'd to be prov'd by fewer and weaker Testimonies than his being guilty.

Fourthly, That when there is a contrariety in the Testimony of the Witnesses, some Swearing against the person, and others of equal Reputation for him, more Faith and Credit ought always to be given to the latter, than the former: And for this he Quotes the Rules of Law. P. 403.

And besides in this case the Witnesses against the Bishop Swear to a Negative, wherein many things, as their ignorance, inadvertence, and their being unacquainted with the matters and forms, may make them be deceiv'd, and mistaken in what they Swear.

Fifthly, That whereas the Writer of the *View*, the Promoter, and their Complices, have Accus'd the Bishop of *Crimen falsi*, they are the persons most egregiously guilty of it, and in more various facts and kinds than could well be imagin'd.

Having finish'd these few Premises, our Author comes to consider the proof produc'd by the Writer of the *View*, which in short is this. That *Edward Williams* and *James Harris* depose that they were Ordain'd Deacons by the Bishop on the 24th of September 1693. and that they then took an Oath Writren on Paper, the words of which they cannot recollect, but positively swear that King *William's* and Queen *Mary's* names were not mention'd in it, and yet in it was certifi'd in.

in their Letters of Orders, that they had taken the necessary Oaths. In Answer to which our Author

First, Observes this Writer's down-right and egregious imposture in confounding the day of the Ordination, (*Sunday*) with other days of the *Ember-Week*, in which several things are to be transacted previous to the Act of Ordination, as Examination, Subscription, taking the Oath of Allegiance (of which more by and by) and the like, which he distinguishes not, but he huddles them together, as if all were to be done on the day of Ordination; our Author says was all Artifice, Trick and Juggle, to impose on, and mislead and deceive his Reader.

P. 408.

Secondly, That the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy are not both to be Administred on the day of Ordination, but only the latter, as may appear to any one who will look into the form and manner of Ordaining Deacons and Priests (so that the Writer of the *View* has here betray'd either his gross Ignorance, or his egregious Infidelity) and therefore accordingly the Bishop in the case before us, did not Administer the Oath of Allegiance on *Sunday* the 24th of *September*, but he actually did on *Saturday* the 23d in his Hall at *Abergwilly*, and the next day the Oath of Supremacy only, in his Chapel, as the Rubrick for ordering Deacons and Priests do's appoint. And therefore

Thirdly, *Williams* and *Harris* Swore foolishly and impertinently, that the Names of *K. William* and *Q. Mary* were not in the Oaths; for it was only the Oath of Supremacy, that they took that day, which had never these names in it. But it is much worse with *Harris*, for he Swears that he knows the new Oaths (in the Plural number) mention *K. William* and *Q. Mary*, which perhaps the ignorant Fellow might think, though it is Notoriously False; But what excuse can be made for the Promoter, and the Writer of the *View*? Why they must e'ne absolve one another, unless the Metropolitan, whose Agents they are, will do it for them both: To which our Author adds, That he is determin'd to believe that both *Williams*, and *Harris* were suborn'd, and brib'd to Swear as they did, and what they depos'd was dictated unto, and drawn from them by others; for which he gives several very plain and convicting reasons.

P. 412,
413.

Fourthly, He observes that there is not one word in either of their Depositions, which is inconsistent with the Bishop's Certificate; for he only certifies that they took the necessary Oaths, which they did at the proper times and places, as before mention'd, viz. on the 23d and 24th of *September*, so that from thence singly, and without making any other Reflections, it does demonstratively appear how unjustly the Bishop of *St. David's* was proceeded against, and that the Metropolitan who Usurp'd the Jurisdiction by taking upon him the alone Juridical Authority in that Process, in order to the depriving the

Bishop

Bishop of *St. David's* did not desire proof on which to condemn him, but only wanted something to palliate, and cover his procedure, which his tools might call evidence.

Fifthly, He adds, that it may well surprise and incline all thinking men to believe that matters were not carried very fairly and impartially in the Process against the Bishop, in that of all the 14 or 15 persons, which these Witnesses Swear were Ordain'd on the 24th of *September* 1693, only two Deacons should be by the Promoter and Agents, produc'd and none of the Presbyters then Ordain'd, should be call'd on to depose any thing in this matter, which looks as if it were believ'd and known, that they would have Sworn to the Bishop's Administring, and their taking the Oaths appointed by Law; and this the Writer of the *View* seems to be sensible of, and therefore endeavours to throw the whole blame on the Bishop, by saying, that he never attempted in the whole Cause, to have any of the rest examin'd; and from thence infers his Lordship's being really guilty of the Crime he was charg'd with; which says our Author, this Writer would never have ventur'd to have said were he not a person of wonderful perversity, and a down right *Corinthian* forehead; in that the Bishop desir'd both of the Metropolitan, and the Delegates, that he might be allow'd to produce some of them, which he also offer'd to have done, who would depose and attest his Lordship's Administring the Oath of Allegiance to *K. William* and *Q. Mary*, on the 23d of *September*, and the Oath of Supremacy on the 24th; but he was deny'd by both of them.

Sixthly, He Answers farther that it ought not only to be suspected that what *Williams* and *Harris* depos'd was false, but that it is Morally certain it must be so, in that it had been prov'd that the Bishop refus'd to admit a certain person (known to be pious and learn'd) into the Order of Deacons, though greatly importun'd to it, meerly because of his denying to take the Oath of Allegiance to *K. William* and *Q. Mary*, and that his Lordship had likewise refus'd to give his License or Connivence to one who was a Presbyter (and withall, a man of singular worth, and his own particular acquaintance) only because of his being one of those (commonly stil'd) Non-Jurors; which two things being Sworn to, They who consider things without prejudice, and prepossession, cannot but believe that the Promoters two Witnesses swore falsly; and it would be surpris'ing (if any thing in some peoples conduct could) that the Metropolitan should render the Bishop of *St. David's* guilty of this *Crimen falsi*, upon the evidence of these two young and ignorant Deacons, when he had the two things before mention'd in proof before him, on the Oaths of two credible Witnesses, who also swore that in both these cases, the Bishop had

declar'd, that the things which had been requir'd of him were such as he neither would, nor could do, in that he was resolv'd to be just to the trustrepos'd in him by the Laws.

P. 417.

Seventhly, He proves by diverse Depositions which he mentions, as full and pertinent to this purpose, and particularly two Witnesses, one of the Bishop's, and the other of the Promoter's own, that the Bishop had at other Ordinations Administred the Oath of Allegiance to *K. William* and *Q. Mary*, and therefore it ought to have satisfy'd the Metropolitan (and if he had been capable either of understanding what was satisfaction, or of receiving it) that it was not omitted *September* the 24th, 1693.

Eighthly and Lastly, The more undeniably to shew these Witnesses of the Promoter to be perjur'd and forsworn, and to expose the Writer of the *View*, as a person of a very shallow understanding in believing, or a most profligate Conscience (if he did not) in imposing these things on the Reader for truths, which at the Instigation, and on the Subornment of others, these ignorant and mercenary Creatures, contrary to their knowledge were gain'd to swear to: Our Author produces the Testimony of several Eye and Ear Witnesses, who swear to the Bishop's Administring the Oaths on the days before mention'd.

First, The Testimony of one Mr. *Davis*, a very credible person, which he has sworn.

Then he subjoyns the Informations and Testimonies of two other Presbyters, Mr. *Williams*, and Mr. *Herbert, M. A.* who were Ordain'd at the same time with *Williams* and *Harris*, who testify in direct opposition to what those poor weak Deacons depos'd, and diverse others who were then admitted are ready to depose the same, that the Oaths were then administred as above.

P. 419.

To which our Author adds, that he has seen an account under the hand of a very pious and learned divine in the Diocese of *St. David's*, that he had spoke with the aforesaid *Edward Williams* the Promoter's Witness against the Bishop, and produced to him the form and manner of Ordering Deacons, and read the Oath of Supremacy there to him, and asking him whether he had taken that Oath, upon which the said *Williams* confess'd and declar'd to him, that he had taken that Oath; and that his mistake in what he had depos'd, proceeded from his not having before understood, but that the King in the Oath of Supremacy, was mention'd and express'd by Name.

P. 420.

Then our Author lays before his Reader, the Declarations, and Depositions of some that were present at that Ordination, and who as they perfectly understood, what Oaths were at that time, and on that occasion to be taken, so they have with all the Sacredness, as well as positiveness imaginable affirm'd, that every thing was done and Executed which the Law appointed and requir'd; And here.

Erf

First, He recites the Deposition of *Francis Thompson*, D. D. who was present at that Ordination, September the 24th. 1693. and several others, who Swear to the Administ'ring both the Oaths in or before all of them.

Then Mr. *Wilfray Piemont*, (who Liv'd with the Bishop Six Years as his Gentleman and Secretary, and particularly was at the Ordination, September 1693.) Swears that the Bishop Administred the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, always at Institutions, and Ordinations, and that he never knew any Ordain'd or Instituted, without taking the said Oaths, and particularly that he saw them both Administred to the Persons Ordain'd, September 1693. And agreeable to, this is also depos'd by Mr. *Robert Douglass*, who liv'd likewise with the Bishop about a Year and a half; And then both the Mr. *Charles Prices*'s Swear to the same effect, who were present at several other Ordinations, did not think of that of that of September 1693.

So that this matter is set in the clearest Light imaginable, and every Reader may now Judge, what portion of Shame and Disgrace, will fall to the share of *Williams* and *Harris*, and more particularly, of the wicked, Promoter, and the Shameless writer of the

And now our Author says, he is come to the last Se^{of the} of the Journey, where the Writer of the *View*, charges the Bishop with another Omission, on Trinity Sunday 1691 which is Depos'd by *Edmund Meyrick* and *Thomas Powel*. To which our Author replies. P. 423.

First, In General that whatever these two hopeful sparks, *Meyrick* and *Powel* have Sworn, and the Writer of the *View* has reported on their Testimony, is impertinent, Sophistical, and False, and that there is nothing, save a Complication, of Malice and Perjury in the former, and of Effrontery and Treachery in the latter, with relation to this matter. But more particularly,

First, He desires the Reader to consider, who these two Witnesses are, and to recollect the Characters that have been given of them before, which how Severe soever they may seem, are not below their Demerit, and more modest than they deserv'd, will undeniably appear by what is farther to be said of them. In order whereunto,

Secondly, He desires the Reader to observe, how and in what terms the 20th. Article against the Bishop runs; for the said Article has charg'd the Bishop with omitting to Administer the Oaths, which the Law requires at Collations or Institutions as well as Ordinations. P. 426. Whereas if the Bishop was so much against the requiring and taking the Oaths, as some people have imagin'd him to be, it is much more likely that he would have omitted them at Collations or Institutions, where fewer Spectators were present, than at Ordinations, where a great Number of Persons, Acting, Assisting, or looking on, were always attending; and therefore having already given the Depositions of

several upon Oath, that the Bishop did at all Collations and Institutions, Administer the Oaths, it gives all men of Sense and Probity, the certainty of a Moral Demonstration, that *Meyrick* and *Powel*, (who have before been prov'd to have Perjur'd themselves in several Instances,) have in this also Sworn Falsly, and Perjuriously.

Thirdly, That in the Depositions recited of *Meyrick*, and *Powel*, there's not the least mention of time when, nor of Persons towards whom his Lordship was guilty of the said Omission. And as there-upon their depositions were such as before, either a Wise or an Impartial Judicature, would have been accounted to have affected no man, so the Metropolitan receiving of them, and the Writer of the *View* reporting them, shew us that some People are either very ignorant through Defects in their understandings, or that they are strongly Tainted with Faults in their wills. For it is not only expressly Provided for, in the Rules laid down both by Civilians and Canonists, but it is likewise Universally agreed to, by common Lawyers, yea Enacted in the very Statutes of *England*, that all Crimes alledg'd and brought into Process against any one, shall be fix'd to a certain time when they were Committed, and the Persons individually nam'd, against whom, and upon whom, they were perpetrated, and so to that purpose it is expressly enacted in the Statute of the 37 of *Hen. 8.* and were it not so, it would be impossible for any man, though never so Innocent, to Justifie himself against Calumnious and Malicious Accusations.

Fourthly, He answers that whereas *Powel* Swears to Oaths, in the Plural Number, which were to be Administred in the Office of Ordination, and that both *Meyrick* and *Powel* Depose, that in the Act of Ordination, *Powel* brought the Book of Ordination, and the Oath therein to the Bishop; that it might be given to the persons who were to be Ordain'd, &c. It is worthy of the Reader's Observation; that, as only one Oath was according to Law, to be Administred in the Office of Ordination, and not Oaths, so the said Oath being the new Oath of Supremacy, was not then Printed in the book of Ordination, and consequently that it was impossible that in bringing the Book, of Ordination to the Bishop, the said Oath should be brought therein, whereby it undeniably appears, that both these Witnesses, not only Swore with great inadvertence, and very much at Random, but that they plainly Depos'd, Falsely and Perjuriously. And therefore it must proceed from want of Judgment, or from want of Integrity, that *Meyrick* and *Powel*, come to be believ'd in any thing they said or Swore, and tho' it has been the Bishop of *St. David's* misfortune, to suffer upon their Testimonies, yet the reproach and disgrace, must at last fall to the share of those who have laid his Lordship under sufferings upon their Depositions.

Our

Our Author has yet another Observation to make on this matter, which will make all the Proceedings against this Prelate fall under wonderful disparagements, as well as become Liable to very great censure; and that is, that the Bishop's Enemies, after the Process against him had been held long, and far advanc'd, being made sensible that *Meyrick* and *Powel*'s Depositions could not Criminally affect the Bishop, (for the reasons before mention'd) they therefore admitted *Lucy* the Promoter, to bring in an Additional Article, and also allow'd *Meyrick* and *Powel* to Swear it, in which the Bishop's omission is setled to a particular Ordination-day and Person: For having gotten the Name of one *Robert Owen* a Deceas'd Kinsman of *Meyrick* who had been Ordain'd the 7th. of June 1691. And having found his Letters of Orders certifying, that he had taken the Requisite Oaths, thereupon both the Promoter formeth a new Additional Article, and the aforesaid two Collusive and Perjurious Witnesses, take an occasion of bringing an insignificant and impertinent General, where neither Time, nor Person were mention'd to a fixt day, and an individual with an assurance and Impudence, peculiar to the worst of Men.

In Answer to which Depositions of these, our Author reserves two things. Whereby not only the Villany of the Bishop's Accusers, but the Injustice of him who acted as Judge, will more Evidently appear, and be made manifest. Whereof the,

First, Is, that it is against Law after Articles have been Exhibited divers years, and a Process upon them, not only Commenc'd but almost brought to a Period, to admit the bringing in of Additional Articles; For all the Rules Establish'd by the Doctors do expressly forbid and Condemn it. For which he quotes the Authority of many Civilians.

And how much in avow'd and plain opposition to all Law and Justice, the Metropolitan acted in this matter, will further and more Evidently appear, from a Relation of true matter of Fact, which our Author subjoyns, namely that this righteous Judge the Metropolitan, concluded the Cause before or very soon after the Bishop of *St. David's* knew the Depositions or could have his Witnesses Examined in *Wales*, to prove that he had actually Administred the Oaths requir'd by Law, on the Articled Ordination-day, viz. Trinity-Sunday, 1691. And tho' the late Lord Chancellour *Sommers*, had declar'd in the House of Peers, that the said Prelate should have Liberty to prove, and alledge what was omitted before the Delegates, divers of those who were appointed Judges Delegates refus'd to admit his Allegations, or to examin the Witnesses his Lordship offer'd to produce, to prove his Administring the Oaths as aforesaid.

And

And now to draw to a Conclusion of this matter, and Sum up the Evidence, on the one side there is no Testimony whatsoever, of *Robert Owen*, that he had not taken the Oaths at his Ordination on *Trinity-Sunday 1691*. but the whole pretended to be in Proof is, that two known Sophisters and Juglers, and the Bishops malicious and profess'd Enemies, having found the Letters of Orders, granted by the Bishop to the said *Robert Owen*, the two aforelaid men of Artifice and Deceit, did thereupon take an advantage of Forging Depositions, wherein they affirm, that the said *Robert Owen*, (who was not Alive to contradict them) had not taken the Oaths requir'd by Law, when he was Ordain'd. In Opposition to which our Author declares.

First, That *David Philips* and *Jakin Williams*, who were Ordain'd on the same *Trinity-Sunday*, with *Robert Owen*, have both positively asserted, and offer'd to Depose upon Oath, that the Oaths which stand Enacted by the Statute of the First of *William and Mary*, were at that time administred by the Bishop, and taken by them and also by *Robert Owen*, to which he withal Subjoyns,

Secondly, The Testimony upon Oath, of *Samuel Williams* a Worthy person who was Ordain'd likewise at the same time, by which all who are not through prejudice and Obstinacy incapable of Conviction, may be fully ascertain'd, that *Meyrick* and *Powel* Swore in Construction Perjuriously, and with design Sophistically.

And now the only thing left to be taken Notice of, in the Summary View is, that the Writer of it declares, that the Bishop told *James Harris*, that he had never omitted the giving the Oaths but once, and that when he Ordain'd for another Bishop. To which our Author Replies.

First, That the said *James Harris* has been made appear, to be too Infamous for any one of common Sense to stake his Credit, as an Historian, upon any thing that Fellow Deposes.

Secondly, That the time refer'd to is, when the Bishop of *St. David's* did Ordain in the behalf of the late Reverend Bishop of *Ely*, *Dr. Turner*, whilst he was under Suspension. And that it is a very Modern Practise to give the Oath of Allegiance at any Ordination whatsoever, for as the Bishop of *St. David's*, neither took nor was requir'd to take the Oath of Allegiance, at the Office of Ordination, when he himself was Ordain'd Deacon, Priest, and Bishop, so during the time he was Bishop in the Reign of the Late King *James*, he never Administred it to any one whom he Ordain'd. And 'tis reasonably suppos'd that his most Malicious Enemies, will not accuse him of being Guilty, of any omission of Duty to that King, which his Lordship was by Law oblig'd to; and yet he never forbore in that Reign to Administer the Oath of Supremacy in the Office of Ordination, though in the Opinion of some, he could not be reckon'd to make his Court by so doing.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, At his Lordship's Ordaining, in the First year of R. William and Q. Mary, for the Bishop of Ely, in the County of Cambridge, he was punctual in giving the Oath of Supremacy to those, whom he then and there Ordain'd; so that in Case he had committed at that time, in that place, and upon that Occasion to Administer the Oath of Allegiance (whereof there is not the least Sillable in Proof in all the Process) yet it could not be accounted a Crime, and much less, said to be done *Dolo malo*, which (as has been Intimated before) must always attend the *Crimen falsi*, and the utmost therefore that Malice itself, even when accomplic'd with Ignorance (for these two are All the most private Conspiracies) can make of it, (supposing it had been so, which does not judicially appear) was only that his Lordship had made a false step before he was well got into his New Trammels, and that he retin'd something of his Ancient Mumpshus, after the Modern Sumpshus was come into Fashion.

To which he adds a Remarkable Story of the present *Præsumptum*, which may be found, [To which may be added a Story of another Nature, to be found.

Our Author now being about to bid Adieu to the Writer, the *View* tells his Reader, that he has made that Writer appear to be, instead of a True Reporter of matter of Fact (which he professes to be) a very Unfaithfull and Treacherous one; and that in the place of relating things Impartially, he has demonstrated his having given only what was said against the Bishop, without vouchsafing to acquaint his Readers with what has been said, and in proof for him, and has likewise through this whole discourse shew'd that.

Committunt eadem diverso Crimina Fato.

To which he adds that if the Writer of the *View* thinks fit to reply, he here promises to rejoyne upon him, which is the last of his Book.

And thus I have finish'd this short Abridgment of the *Large Review*, which might have been shorter yet, if I had not thought it Requisite in most places to keep exactly to the Words of that Author. I think I have not left out any Considerable Passage that was necessary to be taken notice of; Though there is enough left to Entertain the Inquisitive Reader. Upon the whole I doubt not, but what is found here, will be sufficient to give all who Read it, a Just Idea of the Promoter, Witnesses, Judges, Assistants, and every Person and thing concern'd in the whole Procedure against the Bishop of St. David's: And if there has been any Wisdom, Justice, Honesty, Integrity, common Decency, or common Humanity, made appear in the Managers, or Management of this Whole Process; I am sure I can't chuse but find it out, and know where, and upon whose Score to place it.

For nothing is more Reasonable than that every one should have their due, which therefore, at one time or another, will certainly be paid them.

25 April 1703.

Deus dabit his quoque funem.

G.H.

Two

235.
p. 431.

SA.
an- p. 437.

p. 245,
and p. 246.

p. 438.
p. 439.

Two Schedules of Accounts mention'd p. 34. and refer'd to the Appendix following.

Schedule A, settled and paid August 5th, 1691.

Impr. A Bond of 80 l. for Payment of, and Interest from	264	00	00
May 1681.			
Item, L. Journeys to Bugden & Peterborough, for	005	00	00
Order			
For his Arts, Degrees, & own	018	00	00
Paid for his Board Six Months	006	00	00
Item, for first Fruits of Livings and Prebends	045	19	11
Paid Mr. Dowglais by Mr. Medley's Order	001	05	00
Item, to Mr. Lambert at Hull	010	00	00
Paid to his Widow	006	02	00
Item, to Mr. Dowglais Bond of 77 l. and Interest from January	006	00	00
the 1688.			

The Schedule B, which was settled Sept. 21. 1695, following.

Paid for Tenths	004	14	08
To himself at several times	059	08	04
Paid his Mother by his Order	122	05	10
Paid for the first Fruits of the Arch-Deaconry and Prebend of	082	17	02
Llangammarch			
To his Brother Pryse his part of his Sisters Portion	100	00	00
To his Brother Powel part of his other Sister's Portion	124	00	00
Two Years Synodals	005	00	00
A Cloath Gown, Cassock, and Carrier-box	007	15	00

F I N I S.



505—15—08

242—07—05

748—02—10

E R R A T A.

Page 5. l. 9. r. Giffish. p. 9. l. 16. r. Scholar. l. 30. r. Parsonage. p. 13. l. 10. r. Llangaddok. p. 14. l. 2. r. directly. p. 15. l. 35. r. Bishops. p. 16. l. 11. r. Parishes. p. 17. l. 8. dele as 10. p. 23. l. 13. r. Prebends. l. 19. r. Giffish. after, the an, add Prebends. p. 28. l. 37. dele as. l. 43. r. Careffing. p. 30. l. 12. r. Notice. p. 32. l. 11. dele nor. p. 47. l. 12. for me. r. be. penult dele in.